THE DOWNEFALL of Popery.

PROPOSED BY way of a new Challenge, to all Engliſh Ieſuites, and Ieſuited or Italianized papiſts: *daring them all iointly, and euery one of them* ſeuerally, to make anſwere thereunto if they can, *or haue any truth on their ſide; knowing for a truth* that otherwiſe all the world will crie with open mouths, Fye vpon them, and their patched hotch-potch religion.

Pſal. 116. verſ. 10.

Credidi, propter quod locutus ſum.

AT LONDON
Printed by Thomas Purfoot, for *Arthur Iohnſon*, and are to be ſold at the ſigne of the white Horſe, ouer againſt the great North doore of Paules.
1605.

THE DOWNFALL of Popery.

PROPOSED BY

way of a new Challenge, to all

BRITISH MUSEUM

1486

AT LONDON

Printed by Thomas Parfoot, for

TO THE MOST

Puiſſant, Wiſe, Vertuous, Learned, *Iudicious, and Religious Monarch*, IAMES, by Gods permiſsion and holy ordinance, *King of Great Britaine, France and Ireland, defendour* of the auncient Chriſtian Catholike faith, and ſupreme Gouernour within his ſaid Realmes, Kingdomes, Territories, and Dominions, next and immediately vnder GOD, ouer all perſons and cauſes, as wel Eccleſiaſticall as Ciuile,

SIR, THE Truth is of ſuch force (moſt gracious and dread Soueraigne) that it hath enforced the profeſſed enemies of truth (the curſed broode of Engliſh traitorous Ieſuites, and Ieſuited papiſts I meane) to teſtifie the truth againſt themſelues. The ſecular Seminarie prieſts (the Popes owne decree vaſſals, who profeſſe the ſelfeſame religion

religion with the Ieſuits, and yeeld the ſelfe ſame obedience to the Pope,) tell vs plainly in printed bookes publiſhed to the view of the whole world (a thing verie rare and greatly to bee admired) of ſuch brutiſh, barbarous, cruell, villanous, traytorous, and moſt bloodie dealing, practiſed not onely by their deere brethren the Ieſuites, but euen by themſelues alſo, though not in one or the ſame degree; that my ſelfe doubtleſſe could neuer haue giuen credit thereunto, if their owne ſelues had not ſo written, and ſo teſtified againſt themſelues. They affirme conſtantly, in many printed bookes publiſhed to the view of the whole world, that the Ieſuits by treacherous practiſes and moſt bloodie complots, haue long ſought for the vtter ruine and conqueſt of noble England, and that their owne hearts and hands had ſometime been imbrewed with the ſame. They affirme againſt the Ieſuits: Firſt, that they are great lyers. Secondly, that they are proud men, richly apparelled, furniſhed with coaches, and attended on with a great traine of ſeruingmen, as if they were Barrons or Earles: Yea, it is conſtantly auouched, that the Ieſuit *Gerard* had two geldings in a gentlemans ſtable, at thirtie pounds a gelding, beſides others elſe where, and horſes of good vſe. It is alſo ſet downe in print, that a Ieſuit had a girdle & hangers of thirtie pound price. Thirdly, that they trowle vp and downe from good cheere to good cheere, commaunding their chambers to be perfumed, and gentlewomen to pull off their boots. Fourthly, that they are great ſtateſmen, and that matters of ſtate, titles of princes, genealogies of kings,

right

right of succession, disposing of scepters, with other matters of like qualitie, are their chiefe studies. Fiftly, that they threaten a conquest, and promise great preferment to all that will execute their most traitorous designements. Sixtly, that they are cruell tyrants, and firebrands of all sedition. Seuenthly, that they are theeues and murderers, and that the Iesuit *Percie* stole seuen and twentie pound of the common money, by the consent of the other his fellow Iesuits. Eightly, that they haue a mint of counterfeit miracles, with which they labour to seduce the world: Yea, that they endeuoured with a false miracle, to persuade *Sebastian* the late King of Portugall, to establish a setled law, That from thence forward none might be capable of the crowne of Portugall, except he were a Iesuit, or chosen by their societie, as at Rome the Pope is chosen by the Colledge of Cardinals. Ninthly, that the Iesuits are right Machiauels, and that whosoeuer will adhere vnto them, must depend vpon the deuill of hell. Tenthly, that the Iesuits are flat cousiners; and that their religion is nothing else, but a hotchpotch of *omnigiterum*. And to knit vp all in a word, that they are the wickedst men vpon earth.

They confesse against themselues: first, that *Sanders* a secular priest, was the architect of religion, both in England and in Ireland. Secondly, that the same *Sanders* did too much extoll the rebels, seeing they were executed by the auncient lawes of our countrey, for high treason. Thirdly, that the Iesuits came into England by the instinct of

the deuill, and were the chiefest instruments of all traitorous practises against our late Soueraigne of most happie memorie. Fourthly, that popish Seminaries are erected for treason. Fiftly, that the Iesuits and the secular priests expected a chaunge, which now they haue indeed; but God be thanked, to their euerlasting woe and griefe. Sixtly, that the Seminarie priests are sworne to be traytours against their dread Soueraigne and natiue countrey. Seauenthly, that all Iesuited papists must depend vpon the deuill. Eightly, that poperie is inseparably annexed with treason. Ninthly, that the hearts and hands of the secular priests, had sometime beene as deepe in treasonable practises, as the cursed crew of Iesuits. Tenthly, that the lawes of the land are iustly made, both against the Iesuits and themselues; and that they are not put to death for religion, but for treason. Eleuenthly, that long hidden treasons are miraculously reuealed, God so appointing it to be done.

All these asseuerations to be true, (most dread Soueraigne) I am readie to iustifie out of their owne printed bookes, euen vpon the perill of my life, if any of them vpon the like perill, will challenge me to haue charged them falsly in that behalfe.

This notwithstanding, the Iesuits, Seminaries, and other Iesuited papists, doe still expect a tolleration, to liue as they list, within your Maiesties kingdomes and dominions; that is in plaine English, to bee rancke traytours as they haue beene. For this end they neuer cease to buzze into mens heads and eares,

eares, (so to withdrawe them from their due allegeance, and to become popish vassals) that the next Parliament, they shall not faile of their desire. Against this cursed brood, I haue published many bookes; but to this day, could I not receiue answere to any of them all. Neither can they alledge for their excuse, that they haue not seene my bookes, or else they would haue answered the same. For, about a yeere agoe the masked Iesuit *E. O.* did publish a treatise against two learned writers of this age, in which hee taketh notice to the bookes which I haue published against them, and their late vpstart Romish religion, which by piecemeale, and by little and little hath crept into the Church, as I haue prooued at large in my former volumes.

Viz. Against M.D.Sutcliffe & M.Willet.

These are the expresse wordes of the masked Iesuit; To these former, I was once determined to haue adioined a reformed brother of theirs, one *Thomas Bell*, who hath published certaine bookes against the Catholicke Church, and vaunteth mightily, and with insolent words braueth all Seminaries: but I altered my purpose, partly vpon other considerations, but especially, because the confutation of his worthie workes is already vndertaken, and to be published, if it shall be thought necessarie.

In his Preface to the readers.

Thus doth the Iesuit write. By whose wordes it is very apparant, cleere, and euident, that they haue beene many yeeres buzzing about some answere, either to all or some one of my bookes,

but neuer yet durſt aduenture to frame any anſwere to any one of the ſaid bookes, and to publiſh it to the view of the world. Their ſilence in not anſwering my ſaid bookes, hath reclaimed many a man from their popiſh faction: and therefore would they gladly haue the world to thinke, that they are in minde to anſwere my ſaid bookes, but they ſeeme to meane nothing leſſe in deede: and why? he telleth vs forſooth, That the confutation which hath beene long vndertaken, muſt be publiſhed, but with this addition, (If it ſhall be thought neceſſarie.)

What a ieſt is this? the Ieſuits and Seminarie prieſts, haue conſulted now for the ſpace of eight yeeres and aboue, and haue all that time deuiſed how to frame ſome colourable anſwere at the leaſt, to all or ſome of the ſaid bookes; and in the end of the yeere, 1602, haue vndertaken the confutation of my worthy workes (as they ſcornefully tearme them;) but for all that cannot yet tell, whether it be expedient to publiſh the ſaid confutation, or no. Are theſe men the great Statiſts of the world? are theſe men the skilfull Polititians that muſt manage all Europe? are theſe our learned Diuines? are theſe they indeed, vpon whoſe doctrine and guiding all Lay-papiſts do depend, and on their ſhoulders do hang their ſoules and ſaluation? doubtleſſe, they may preach this goodly ſermon to wiſe men, but onely noddies and ſtarke fooles will beleeue them. In regard hereof (moſt dread Soueraigne) and becauſe I greatly deſire once during my life, to receiue anſwere to ſome part of my labours

publiſhed againſt our Engliſh Ieſuited papiſts, that ſo wee may valiantly fight the combat, my ſelfe ſo hauing occaſion to reply vpon their anſwere, which would bee to mee *melle & fauo dulcius*; I haue compiled and couched in a ſmall roome, a fewe diſtinct articles: for anſwere whereunto, I once againe challenge *Robert Perſons*, that traitorous Ieſuit; *George Blackwell* that ſeditious and late ſtart-vp Arch-prieſt; and all other Engliſh Ieſuits, Seminarie prieſts, and Ieſuited papiſts, whoſoeuer and whereſoeuer, ioyntly and ſeuerally; daring them all ioyntly, and euerie one of them ſeuerally, to anſwere either all my bookes, or ſome one of them, or theſe fewe articles; or at leaſt to confeſſe plainely, that they cannot anſwere, becauſe I hold and defend the truth. Theſe my late ſtudies (moſt gratious Soueraigne) I haue preſumed to dedicate vnto your Maieſtie, in congratulation of your moſt happie raigne ouer vs; whom God of his great mercie hath raiſed vp in our greateſt neceſsitie, to continue his holy Goſpell among vs, and to aboliſh all Idolatrie and ſuperſtition out of his Church. It is not ſuch a preſent I confeſſe, as beſeemeth your moſt royall excellencie; yet ſuch a one, as my ſmall talent is able to affoord: I moſt humbly beſeech your Highneſſe for to accept it, as our Lord Ieſus Chriſt did accept the two mytes of the poore Widdow; and withall for to protect and patronize the ſame, againſt the traitorous Ieſuits and

Iesuited papists within your Maiesties Realmes; who seeke by might and maine (as I am credibly informed) not onely to impaire my good fame and name with their malicious tongues, but also to take away my life with their bloodie hands. The Almightie blesse your Maiestie with long, prosperous, and happie raigne in this world, and with euerlasting life in the world to come, Amen. From my studie this fourteenth of Ianuarie. 1603.

Your Maiesties loyall subiect, and faithfull seruant,

Thomas Bell.

To all Engliſh Ieſuits, Seminarie priests, and Ieſuited papists, in England, Scotland, or whereſoeuer elſe.

I Haue written many times at large in larger volumes, heartily and inſtantlie deſiring to haue receiued ſome anſwere from you, either from all ioyntly, or from ſome of you ſeuerallie. In my firſt booke, publiſhed in the yeare 1593, I promiſed to yeeld, if any of you could conuince me; either to haue alleadged any writer corruptlie, or to haue quoted any place guilefullie, or to haue charged any author falſlie: ſince that time I haue challenged you againe and againe to anſwer me, but Ne gry quidem *will be had; no anſwer can you make, or dare you make. In regard hereof, I haue at this preſent compiled a few articles couched in a ſmall roome, challenging you once againe, to frame the beſt anſwer you can vnto the ſame: if you can ſincerelie and trulie confute theſe articles, or any one of my former bookes, I promiſe herewith (and I proteſt before God to performe it) to ſubſcribe vnto your doctrine. If you therefore ſhall refuſe*

In my Motiues, booke 2. chap. 1.

fuse to answere me, because you cannot, for if you can, you will vndoubtedlie performe it) all wise men which haue any care of their saluation, will without all peraduenture after notice hereof made knowen vnto them, crie, Fie vpon you and your religion.

Answere therefore ô papists, if ye can; if ye cannot so do, then repent for shame, and yeeld vnto the truth.

Farewell.

THE FIRST ARTICLE,

of the falsely so supposed soueraignetie of the Bishop of Rome.



OU Papists tell vs, that your Pope, the Bishop of Rome, is aboue all powers and potentates on earth, that he can depose Kings and Emperours from their royall thrones, and translate their Empires and Regalities at his good will and pleasure. But this doctrine is false, absurd, and nothing els but a meere fable: and consequently, late romish religion consisteth of meere falshoods, fables, and flat leasings.

The proposition, the Iesuit *Bellarmine* that late Romish Cardinall, setteth downe in these words: *Si ergo princeps aliquis ex oue aut ariete fiat lupus, id est, ex Christiano fiat haereticus, poterit pastor ecclesiæ eum arcere per excommunicationem, & simul iubere populo, ne eum sequantur, ac proinde priuare eum dominio in subditos.* *Bellarm. lib. 5. de Rom pont. ca. 7. col. 834.*

If therefore any prince of a sheepe or ramme become a wolfe, that is to say, of a Christian be made an heretick: then the pastors of the Church (the Pope forsooth) may

driue him away by excommunication, and withall commaund the people not to obey him, and therefore deptiue him of his dominion ouer his subiects. Thus we see, that when any prince is not, or ceaseth to be a Papist, for that (with this Iesuiticall Cardinall and all others of his brood) is to be an hereticke; then the Pope forsooth may depose such a prince from his royall scepter, and absolue his subiects from their alleageance to him. This is the common doctrine of all Iesuited Papists, as I haue proued in my anatomie of Popish tyrannie.

Gregor. lib. 2. epist. 61. cap. 100. The assumption is prooued by the flat testimonie of their famous Pope *Gregorie* the great, in these words: *Ego quidem in scioni subiectus, eandem legem per diuersas terrarum partes transmitti feci; & quia lex ipsa omnipotenti deo minime concordat, ecce, per suggestionis meæ paginam, serenissimis dominis nunciaui; vtrobique ergo quæ debui exolui, qui & imperatori obedientiam præbui, & pro deo quod sensi, minimè tacui.*

I being your subiect, and at your commaund, haue caused the same law to be sent through diuerse parts of the land; and because the law it selfe doth not accord to Gods will, behold, I haue signified so much vnto your Maiestie by my epistle; and so I haue discharged my dutie in both respects, as who haue rendered mine obedience to the Emperour, and haue not concealed what I thought in Gods behalfe.

These are the words of *Gregorius*, who was himselfe Bishop of Rome *anno* 603. and liued aboue six hundred yeares after Christ; for which time the Popes liued in dutifull obedience vnder the Emperours, as is euident by his expresse words alreadie alleaged: For first, Pope *Gregorie* freely and willingly acknowledgeth the Emperour to be his soueraigne lord.

Secondly, he confesseth himselfe to be the Emperours subiect.

Thirdly, he graunteth that he oweth loyall obedience to the Emperour, and for that respect he thought himselfe bound in conscience to publish the Emperours lawe; though

though in some part it seemed to disagree with Gods will; and that (forsooth) least he should be found guiltie of disloyaltie toward his prince.

Fourthly, this alleageance he acknowledged to the Emperour *Mauritius*, who liued more than six hundred yeares after Christs sacred incarnation. During which tearme of yeares, the bishops of Rome, now called Popes, liued in subiection to the Emperours of Rome, as other bishops doe this day to their lawfull kings.

S. *Ambrose* freeth Kings from all lawes made by man, these are his expresse words: *Rex vtique erat; nullis ipse legibus tenebatur humanis. Neque enim reges vllis ad pœnam vocantur legibus, tuti imperij potestate. Homini ergo non peccauit, cui non tenebatur obnoxius.* *Ambros. de apologia Dauid, ca.10.pa.386.*

He was indeed a King, he was subiect to no lawe of man: for Kings being freed by royall prerogatiues of imperiall power, are not punishable by the lawes of man. He therefore sinned not to man, to whom he was not subiect. S. *Hierome* teacheth the same doctrine, if his words be well marked. *Hiero.tom.1. fol.63.d.*

Enthimius hath these words, *Cum sim rex, & te solum commissorum à me scelerum iudicem habeam, tibi soli peccasse videor; hoc est, tibi soli iudici subijcior. Cæterorum enim omnium ego dominus sum, & ob potentiam meam licere mihi videntur, quæcunque libuerint.* *Enthi.in Psal. 50.*

Seeing I am a King, and haue thee only my iudge ouer my sinnes, I seeme to sinne onely to thee; that is, I am subiect onely to thee, as to my iudge. For I am lord ouer all others, and in regard of my power and maiestie, whatsoeuer pleaseth me, seemeth to be lawfull for me.

The Popish ordinarie glosse singeth the same song, these are the expresse words: *Rex omnibus superior, tantum à deo puniendus est.* *Glossa ordin. in Psal.50.*

The King is aboue all, and he can be punished of none but of God alone.

Nicolaus Lyranus, a man of great reckoning with the Papists, teacheth the same doctrine with the rest. These *Lyranus in Psal.50.*

are his expresse words; *Tibi soli peccani, scilicet tanquam iudici & punire potenti. Peccauerat enim contra Uriam, & alios occasione huius interfectos. Tamen quia erat rex, non habebat iudicem superiorem qui posset eum punire, nisi deum.*

To thee onely haue I sinned; that is to say, to thee only, as to my iudge, and to him that can punish me. For he had now sinned against *Urias* and others, whom he caused to be murthered by that occasion: yet because he was a king, he had no superior iudge that could punish or controule him, saue God alone.

Aquin. 1. 2. q. 96. ar. 5. ad. 3.

Thomas Aquinas, being as it were halfe a god with the Papists, teacheth the selfesame doctrine, with *Lyra* and the rest. But I hasten to the verdict of a Cardinall of Rome.

Hugo Card. in Psal. 50.

Hugo Cardinalis hath these expresse words; *Tibi soli, quia non est super me alius quam tu, qui possit punire. Ego enim sum rex, & non est aliquis præter te super me.*

To thee, onely, saith Cardinall *Hugo*, because there is not any aboue me but thy selfe alone, that hath power to punish me: for I am a king, and so besides thee, there is none aboue me.

See S. *Cyprians* opiniō in the sixt article following, in the first proposition and secōd reason; and note it well, because it is of great impo. tance.

Thus gentle reader, it is cleere and euident, as well by the flat testimonie of the auntient fathers, as also of most famous and renowned Popish writers; that the Pope or Bishop of Rome is so farre from hauing power to depose Kings and Emperours, that he himselfe ought to be subiect to them, and hath no authoritie at all to punish them. What can be more plainely spoken? what testimonies can be more manifest? what doctrine can be clearer? for if none but God be superior to the king, if none but God can iudge the king, if none but God can punish the king, (all which both auntient fathers and the Popes owne deare doctors affirme) then doubtlesse cannot the Pope depose the king; then can he not absolue his subiects from their alleageance; then can he not translate empires and kingdomes, and bestow the same at his owne pleasure. The good kings, *Iosua*, *Dauid*, *Salomon*,

Salomon, Iosaphat, Ezechias, and *Iosias,* knew right well, that they had authoritie aboue all the priests, and therefore tooke vpon them, not onely to commaund and controll them, but also to depose and thrust them from their places and functions, yea euen the high priests themselues, when their deserts did so require. Which thing is prooued at large in my golden ballance of triall. Yet here for better satisfaction of the vulgar people, I will propound a common obiection, that much troubleth many of them; and that done, frame a plaine and sincere solution to the same.

The Obiection.

The Empire was translated by the Popes authoritie, and the Emperours after their election are this day confirmed by the Pope: yea, many Emperours haue acknowledged the Popes soueraignetie ouer them, in so much as they haue fallen downe prostrate, and kissed his holy feet.

The Answere.

I answere, that many absurd things haue beene affirmed by Popish parasites, for the aduancement of the primacie, as *Franciscus à Victoria,* a famous Popish schoole doctor, and Spanish frier, sometime professour of Theologie in the Vniuersitie of Salmantica, doth testifie in these words; *Sed glossatores iuris hoc dominium dederunt papæ, cum ipsi essent pauperes rebus & doctrina.* *Victor. de potest. eccles. relect. 1. sect. 2. pag. 39.*

But the glossers of the Popes law (saith this great doctor and zealous papist, for the truth it selfe enforced him to vtter the truth) gaue this dominion (and these lordly titles) vnto the Pope, when themselues were blind bayards and beggerly fellowes.

Thus writeth their owne Popish Frier, affirming that ignorance and pouertie were the beginning of all lordly poperie: and no maruell; for by reason of their pouertie

they flattered and sought to please the Pope, and by reason of their ignorance, they set abroach many things which they did not vnderstand.

Iohannes Gerson, a famous papist likewise, and sometime chancelour of Paris, reporteth much like stuffe, and more lordly titles, ascribed to the Pope by his popish parasites. These are his expresse words; *Sicut Christo collata est omnis potestas in cœlo & in terra, sic eam Christus omnem Petro suisq; successoribus dereliquit. Sequitur, sicut non est potestas nisi à deo, sic nec aliqua temporalis vel ecclesiastica, imperialis vel regalis, nisi à Papa; in cuius fœmore scripsit Christus, rex regum, dominus dominantium; de potestate disputare, instar sacrilegij est; cui neq; quisquam dicere potest, cur ita facis.*

Gerson de potest. eccl. consid. 12. part. 3.

As all power was giuen to Christ in heauen and on earth, so Christ left all the same power to *Peter*, and to his successours (the Bishops of Rome.) As there is no power but of God, so is there neither any temporall or ecclesiasticall, neither imperiall nor regall, but of the Pope; in whose thigh Christ hath written, the King of Kinges and Lord of Lords; of whose power to dispute, is as it were sacriledge; to whome no man may say, Why doest thou so?

These are the words of this great learned Doctor, who though he were a zealous Papist, yet could hee not conceale these Antichristian blasphemies within his breast. Neuertheless Pope *Boniface*, or (if ye will) Pope *Maliface*, did not only acknowledge them, but with great pleasure practised the same, as witnesseth the sayd *Gerson* in these words; *Hanc existimationem habuisse visus est Bonifacius octauus in quadam decretali; putatur ab aliis, depositio vnius regis francie per papam Zachariam hic esse fundata; tanquam papa sit, qui transferre possit reges & regna.*

Gerson vbi supra.

Pope *Boniface* the eight seemeth in a certaine decretall to haue had this opinion of his owne authoritie. Others thinke, that the deposition of (*Childericus*) the French King by Pope *Zacharie*, was grounded in this (Antichristian and godlesse conceit:) as if forsooth the Pope were he,

he, that could depóse princes, and translate their Kingdomes.

By these authorities it is cleare, that the late Bishops of Rome haue taken vpon them, not onely to depose kings, and to translate their kingdomes: but withall haue challenged more than humane and royall power, euen that power which is due and proper to God alone. So as wee haue not so much to consider what hath beene done, as what ought of right to be done. I will therefore for perspicuitie sake proceede by way of gradation, and set downe the verie steps of the ladder, by which the late Bishop of Rome, did climbe vp to their vsurped tyrannicall primacie.

1 The first steppe, was the departure of the Emperour *Constantius* from Rome to Constantinople, at what time (as the *Popes* parasites tell vs) the Emperour gaue large gifts to the *Pope*, euen his whole power, dominion, and territories, both in Rome, Italie, and all the West partes: for thus is it written by *Gratian* in the *Popes* own decrees: *Constantius imperator coronam & omnem regiam dignitatē, in vrbe Romana, & in Italia, & in partibus occidentalibus Apostolico concessit. Sequitur, decreuimus itaq́, & hoc, vt ipse & successores eius diademate, viz.. corona quam ex capite nostro illi concessimus ex auro purissimo & gemmis pretiosis, vti debeat pro honore B. Petri.* *Constantine* the Emperor gaue the Pope his crowne and all royall dignitie in the City of Rome, and in Italie, and in all the West parts. It followeth a little after in the next Cannon. We therefore haue made also this decree, that the Pope and his successors shall for the honor of S. *Peter*, weare the crowne of pure gold and pretious stones, which we haue giuen him from off our owne head. Thus saith the decree. But *Laurentius Valla*, *Raphael Volaterranus*, *Paulus Catthalanus*, *Nicholaus Cusanus*, and many other popish writers, repute the same as a fable. Yea our Iesuit *Bellarmine* seemeth to doubt thereof, and of other like supposed donations, and therefore hath he inuented a soueraigne remedie for the same. These are his expresse words:

Dist. 96. can. Constantinus.

Bellarm. lib. 5. de rom. pont. cap. 9.

Extant

Extant Romæ authentica instrumenta harum & similium donationum. Sed etiamsi nihil horum extaret, abunde sufficeret præscriptio 800. annorum. Nam etiam regna & imperia per latrocinium acquisita, tandem longo tempore fiunt legitima.

There be extant at Rome authenticall instruments of these and the like gifts. But if there were no such thing, yet would prescription of 800. yeares be sufficient: for euen kingdomes and empires gotten by robberie, through continuance of time become lawfull. Thus writeth our Iesuit, who hath left nothing vnsaid, that can be said for poperie.

The second step, was the fall of the Empire in the West. For after the diuision of the Empire, it begun daily to decline, and was vtterly dissolued in *Augustulus*, in the yeare 471. of whom was made this epigram; *Augustus romanum imperium condidit, Augustulus labefactauit. Augustus* set vp the Empire, but *Augustulus* pulled it downe. For after *Orestes* his father was slaine (who was neuer Emperour but a Captaine vnder *Nepos*) the said *Augustulus* gaue vp the diademe, and betooke himselfe to a priuate life. From this time the Empire in the West was vacant about 330 yeares. By meanes whereof, the Popes power did daily increase by little and little, and from step to step.

A.D. 471. *Ar Pontac. Burdeg. pa.* 93.

The Visigothes ruled in Spaine, the Abienes in Guian and Gascoyn, the Frenchmen in the residue of France, the Vandales in Affricke, the Saxones in Brittaine, the Ostrogothes in Hungarie, the Herules and Turdilings in Italie and in the citie of Rome: onely the name of the Empire, remained with *Zenon* in the East. About the yeare 536. *Totilas* king of the Gothes by force of armes and famine subdued well neere all Italie, and after long siege tooke the citie of Rome, and spoyled it with sword and fire, ouerthrowing the wals and towers euen to the ground, and vntill *Carolus magnus* the Abiens and Barbarians possessed all Italie.

A.D. 536.

The third step was the voluntarie Charter which *Constantine* the Emperour of Constantinople made to

Pope

Pope *Benedict* the second; *viz.* that whomsoeuer the clergie, people, and the Romaine souldiours should chuse to be Bishop, all men should beleeue him to be the true vicar of Christ, without any tarrying for any authoritie of the Emperour of Constantinople, or the Deputie of Italie, as the custome and maner was euer before that day. Thus writeth *Platina*, who was the Popes owne deere vassale. This was a verie gallant step: for as you see here, the Popes for the space almost of seuen hundred yeeres, *viz.* vntill this *Bennet* in the yeare 684. acknowledged the Emperours for their superiours and lords, without whose letters pattents they could haue no iurisdiction, nor be reputed the true Bishops of Rome: but now the Bishops of Rome by priuiledge graunted from this Emperour, wrested their neckes from the Emperours subiection. Let these words of *Platina* be well remembred; beeause he being a famous Papist, must needes be of good credit against them. I let passe the petite step, when the Emperor *Phocas* made Rome the head of all Churches, which for all that, is of some moment.

A. D. 684.

Platina in vita Benedicti secundi.

Vide Ar. Pontac fol. 111. a.

A. D. 607.

The fourth steppe, was the great amitie betweene *Zacharie* then Bishop of Rome, and *Pipine* Gouernour of France vnder *Childerich* the King: for *Pipine* purposing to defeat his Lord and Soueraigne of the Kingdome, and to inuest himselfe therein, sent his Embassadours to *Zacharie* then Bishop of Rome, and his bounden friend, to demaund this question of him, *viz.* Whether he were more worthy to be King, which was king only by name and naturall succession; or els he, who bare the whole burthen of the kingdome alone, & yet lacked the dignitie of a King? The Pope vnderstanding the parable right well, and respecting his owne future aduancement likely to ensue thereupon, answered roundly (I will not say clerkely, but like a right Doctor of the Romish rout) that it was more rightfull forsooth, that he which tooke the charge of all things, should be called King. Vpon this iudgement so clerkely yeelded, *Pipine* forthwith presumed to depose

A. D. 752.

Childerich, and made himselfe King: that done, faintlesse (not sackelesse) *Zacharie* the Bishop of Rome (that Antichrists forerunner might be knowne) assoiled *Pipine* and the other Frenchmen of their oath of allegeance and fealty made to *Childerich*, and confirmed *Pipine* the traitor in the kingdome of France. This was indeed a step, not of *Iacobs* ladder, nor of *Scala cœli*, but of *Scala inferni*, *Scala Antichristi*, and of the ladder of the Maister Diuell of Hell. Yet is not our Iesuit and Cardinall *Bellarmine* (the mouth of all papists, and of the Pope himselfe) ashamed to publish the same as a ground of the popish Religion. For these are his owne words: *Childericum deposuit Zacharias, & in eius locum Pipinum Caroli magni patrem creari iussit. Cuius causa fuit, quia propter socordiam Childerici, & religioni & regno in Gallia extrema ruina imminere videbatur.*

Genes. 28. v. 12.

Bellar. lib. 5. de Rom. pont. cap. 8.

Pope *Zacharie* deposed *Childericke*, and commaunded to place and inuest *Pipine*, father to *Charles* the great, in his throne: the cause whereof was this: because forsooth through the slouthfull and negligent gouernment of *Childericus*, the Kingdome and religion in Fraunce seemed to be in great danger. This is the deepe Diuinitie of the Pope and his Clergie, by which we may learne many worthy Lessons.

1 First, that the Pope may set vp and pull downe kings at his pleasure by Iesuiticall doctrine and late Romish religion.

2 Secondly, that the Pope and Iesuites are the grandmasters and architects of seditions, rebellions, and most bloudie treasons.

3 Thirdly, that it is verie true which the secular priests haue written, concerning the traiterous proceedings of Iesuits and Iesuited papists.

4 Fourthly, that the Pope commaunded to depose the Soueraigne, and to inthronize the subiect in his place.

5 Fiftly, that all this was done, because forsooth the King did not rule after the Popes fansie and pleasure. Hereupon I inferre this necessarie corrolarie: *viz.* that it be-

behoueth Christian Kinges to bee vigilant, and in due time to expell all trayterous Papists out of their Dominions. And if the Bishop of Rome shall send any seditious Popeling into their Kingdomes and territories, with his thunderbolts, buls, and excommunications; then to deale with th the Messengers, as King *Philip* the faire dealt with Pope *Boniface* his nuncioes in France; whom he committed to prison, and caused the Popes buls to bee burnt in the fire. And as *Charles* the sixt, when *Bennet* the 13. did interdict his realme, sitting in the throne of iustice in his high Court of Parliament the 21. of May, in the yeere 1408. gaue sentence, that the Bull should bee rent in pieces, and that *Gonsalue* and *Conselenx* the bearer thereof should bee set vpon a Pillorie, and publiquely traduced in the pulpit. The storie is set downe at large by the French papists, in their booke intituled, the Iesuites Catechisme, and the same is recorded in my Anatomie of Popish tyrannie.

A.D.1194.

A.D.1408.

The fift steppe was the decay of the Empire in the East about the yeere 756. For when *Aistulphus*, or (as some write) *Aristulphus* King of the Lombards, besieged the citie of Rome for the space of three whole Moneths, exacting an huge tribute of the Romanes; then Pope *Stephanus* the second, made suite to *Pipinus* King of France to stand their good Maister, and to defend the Citie from the furie of the Lombards. King *Pipine* willing to gratifie his good frieud the Bishop of Rome, came with a mightie armie against *Aistulphus*, and besieged him in Pauie; and then and there constrained him to appeale to his mercie, and to yeeld vp the exerchate of Rauenna and Pentapolis into his handes. This being effected, King *Pipine* (whom Pope *Zacharie* of a traytor had made King, as is alreadie prooued) gaue vp the gouernement of Italie into the Popes handes. And the King had reason so to doe: for as we know, one good turne requires another. So now the Lieutenants of the Emperours of Constantinople, ended their whole power in Italie, who aforetime had their seats

A.D.756.

Manus manum fricat.

at Rauenna: and now was he taken out of the way, who
2. Thess. 2. (as the Apostle telleth vs) did hinder the comming of Antichrist: for Pope *Stephen* in way of gratitude confirmed the inheritance royall of the kingdome of France to the said *Pipine* and to his posteritie for euer. Here began a new progenie of the kings of France: for *Childericus* was the last king of the stocke of *Meroneus*, who was the first king Christian of France. This truth is apparant by the testimonie of many renowned Chronographers, it cannot be denied.

Bellar. tom. 3. col. 827. The sixt step, was the translation of the Romane Empire from the Greeks to the Frenchmen or Germans, in the person of magnificall *Charles*, as the Iesuit *Bellarmine* tearmeth him. The truth is this, as popish Chronographers doe record and testifie to the world; *viz.* That when the Romanes had driuen from among them, Pope *Leo* the third, he appealed to *Charles* then King of France, who came to Rome, and examined the matter: and in the end appeased the Romanes, and restored the Pope to his place and dignitie againe. For this good worke and kinde fauour of the King, the Pope, and people of Rome, hauing now a long time in minde and affection, reuolted from the Emperour of Constantinople; and seeing a fit opportunitie offered to accomplish their long wished desires, did with vniforme consent and ioyfull acclamation proclaime *Charles* the great, the Emperour of Rome, giuing him the imperiall names of *Cæsar* and *Augustus*, and setting the royall diademe vpon his head by the hands of Pope *Leo*. And for the better credit of mine assertion, I will heere recount the very words of *Sigebertus*, a famous Chronographer and popish Monke, who therefore must needs be of credit with the Pope and all his popelings. Thus doth he write: *Romani, qui ab imperatore Constantinopolitano iam diu animo desciuerant, nunc accepta occasionis opportunitate, quia mulier (excæcato imperatore Constantino filio suo) eis imperabat, vno omnium consensu Carolo regi imperatorias laudes acclamant, eumque per manũ Leonis Papæ coronant,*
A.D. 801. *Cæsarem*

Cæsarem & Augustum appellant; Pipinum verò filium eius regem Italiæ ordinatum collaudant.

The Romanes, who a long time had in mind and affection reuolted from the Emperour of Constantinople, seeing now a fit occasion offered them, because a woman did gouerne them, her sonne the Emperour *Constantine* being made blind, did all with one consent sound out imperiall and royall acclamations to king *Charles*, calling him *Cæsar* and *Augustus*, and crowning him by the hand of *Leo* the Pope: yea they collaud his son *Pipine* made king of Italie.

Out of these words I wish the Reader, to obserue these important points with me.

1 First, that 800. yeeres after Christs sacred birth, the Bishops of Rome were subiect to the Emperour, as their owne deere Monke *Sigebert* telleth them; and as you haue heard already, Pope *Gregorie* acknowledged his fealtie to *Mauritius* the Emperour, in the yeere 603.

2 Secondly, that the Pope and people of Rome endeuoured a long time, to shake off the yoke of obedience to the Emperour, and in the yeere 801. put the same in execution.

3 Thirdly, that the translation of the Empire implied flat treason, in the Pope and all his Romish Popelings. For as Frier *Sigebert* telleth vs, they surrendred vp the right of their soueraigne to an other man: and hence commeth it, that the Iesuiticall Cardinall *Bellarmine* appealeth to the law of perscription, affirming titles gotten by robberie to be lawfull by that meanes. And indeede by stealth and robberie, it may well beseeme a Iesuite, to iustifie popish late start vp regalitie.

4 Fourthly, that the Bishop of Rome is not the true and lawfull king of Italie: for the Papists doe not agree in their assertions, touching this counterfeit regalitie of their Popes. *Blondus* and *Platina* write, that *Pippine* gaue the exerchate of Rauenna and Pentapolis to *Gregorie*; *Regino* referreth the donation to *Steuen*; and *Sigebert* saith here, that *Pippine* in the yeere 801. had it in his owne pos-

session still. Yea, the same *Sigebert* saith further, that in the yeere 812. the Emperour *Charles* imposed the imperiall Crowne vpon the head of his sonne *Lewis*, and made *Bernard* sonne of *Pippine* the King of Italie. But doubtlesse if *Pippine* were King of Italie in the yeere 801. and *Bernard* King thereof in the yeere 812, I see not how the Pope was
A.D.727. then, or that is now, any King at all. And therefore wee may credite *Bellarmine* at leasure, when hee telleth vs out of *Ado*, that king *Pippine* gaue Reuenna and all Pentapolis to Saint *Peter* and Saint *Paul*: but it is well, that S. *Paul* is become coheire with Saint *Peter*. For by his meanes, other Bishops must haue as great a share, as the Bishops of Rome: there the Reader must not forget, what Frier *Sigebert* telleth vs of *Charles* the great, after that hee was in-
A.D.805. thronized in the Empire. These are his expresse wordes; *Carolus imperator &c.* *Charles* the Emperor, when the Emperours of Constantinople had indignation against him, for the name of Emperour giuen him by the Romanes; suffered them with great patience and magnanimitie? And because hee was afraide of their mightie power, with often Ambassades hee procured them to bee his deere friends: yet our Iesuit *Bellarmine* would haue vs to beleeue, that the Emperours of Constantinople did freely graunt, that the Pope and the Romanes had full right to translate the Empire; but their owne deere friend (as wee see heere,) affirmeth the contrarie for a truth. Yea, both
Vide Ar. Pontac. fol.112. *Blandus* and *Platina* affirme verie constantly, that *Charles* did agree first with the Empresse *Irene*, and after with the Emperour *Nicephorus*, that hee with their fauours might rule ouer the West.

The seuenth steppe, was the constitution of the electors of the future Emperour. For *Gregorie* the fift being
Vide Phil. p. Bergomens. p.277. Antoninus 3. par. tit. 22. ca. 5. §. 13. a Germane borne, and a neere kinsman to *Otho* the Emperour at that time, did by his fauour and free graunt, appoint seuen electors of the Empire for euer. *viz.* the Archbishop of Mentz, the Archbishop of Treuerse, the Archbishop of Colen, the marques of Brandenburgh, the countie

tie Palatine, the Duke of Saxonie, and the King of Bohemia. This godly conſtitution was enacted by the Pope and Emperour, (being both of them not only Germanes but alſo kinſmen) that the Empire might bee eſtabliſhed in their poſteritie, and their blound thereby aduaunced for euer. A.D.994.

The eight and higheſt ſtep of this ladder, did reach vp euen to the higheſt heauen, and to the verie throne of our Lord Ieſus. For the Pope hauing now enlarged his ſoueraigntie, by little and little, from ſteppe to ſteppe: was neither abaſed nor afraide to challenge the authoritie and royall right, of both ſwordes throughout the Chriſtian world: for hee made a flat decree for the confirmation thereof, as is euident by the extrauagant of *Boniface* the eight, (*vnam ſanctam, de majoritate & obedientia*) ſet downe in the ſixt Booke of the decretals. And as *Gratianus* reporteth, Pope *Nicholes* taught the ſame doctrine: theſe are the expreſſe words, *Chriſtus beato Petro eterna vitæ claui-gero, terreni ſimul & cæleſtis imperij iura commiſit.* A.D.1294. *Dest. 22. Can. omnes.*

Chriſt committed to Saint *Peter* that beareth the keyes of eternall life, the right both of earthly and heauenly Empire. And the gloſſe, which the Popes paraſites haue annexed to this decree, hath theſe verie wordes: *Argumentum quod Papa habet vtrumq; gladium, & ſpiritualem & temporalem.* An argument, that the Pope hath both the ſwords, aſwell the ſpirituall as the temporall. And in the marginall note, it is there ſet downe, *Papa habens vtrumq; gladium tranſtulit imperium*: the Pope hauing both ſwords, tranſlated the Empire. And *appendix Fuldenſis* vnfoldeth this curſed decree, in theſe moſt plaine tearmes: *Gloſ. F. cæleſt.*

Hic Papa (Bonifacius 8.) conſtitutionem fecerat, in qua ſe dominum ſpiritualem & temporalem in vniuerſo mundo aſſerebat. Vnde requiſiuit Philippum regem Francia, vt a ſe regnum ſuum cognoſceret, quod Rex facere contempſit. *Appendix Fuldenſis.*

This Pope (hee ſpeaketh of *Boniface* the eight) made a conſtitution, in which he affirmed himſelfe, to bee both ſpirituall and temporall Lord in the whole world. Where-

vpon

vpon hee would haue had *Philip* King of France, to haue acknowledged his Kingdome from him: which thing the King scorned to doe,

Since this ladder was thus framed, the Bishops of Rome haue tyrannized aboue measure in the world, and taking vpon them that authoritie which pertaineth to God alone, they haue disposed of Kings and Kingdomes, translated royall diademes, tyrannized ouer mens soules, and troden all sacred soueraignetie vnder foot. For, that popish canons ascribe plaine diuine titles to the Pope, it can not possibly be denied, because in the Popes owne decretals, I finde these expresse wordes; *Sic (Papa) dicitur habere cœleste arbitrium, & ideo etiam naturam rerum immutat, substantiam vnius rei applicando alij; & de nihilo potest aliquid facere.* So the Pope is saide to haue celestiall arbitrement, and therefore doth hee alter the nature of things, applying the substantiall parts of one thing to another; and so can make of nothing something. Thus the Papists write of their Pope, and hee is well pleased therewith. And yet the truth is, that as man can in some cases at sometime make one thing of an other; so in all cases at all times, to make some thing of nothing, is proper to God alone.

Gloss. lib 1. decret: tit. 7 ca. 3

Gers. de potest. eccles. consider. 12. part. 3.

The Popes parasites write thus of his power in generall; *Sicut non est potestas nisi adeo, sic nec aliqua temporalis vel ecclesiastica, imperialis vel regalis, nisi à Papa; in cuius fœmore scripsit Christus, rex regum, dominus dominantium.* Like as there is no power but of God, so is there neither any temporall nor ecclesiasticall, neither imperiall nor regall, but of the Pope; in whose thigh Christ hath written, the King of kings, and Lord of lords. Loe here gentle Reader, two things are proper to God alone; the one, to be King of kings, and Lord of lords; the other, to be the author of all power: both which you see here ascribed to the Pope.

Greg. 9. libr. 1. decr. tit. 33. cap. 6.

The Pope himselfe from his own pen, *Gregorie* the nynth, deliuereth vs this doctrine, *Ad firmamentum cœli, hoc est, vniuersalis ecclesiæ, fecit deus duo magna luminaria, id est, duas*

instituit

inſtituit dignitates, quæ ſunt pontificalis authoritas, & regalis poteſtas ſequitur; vt quanta eſt inter ſolem & lunam, tanta inter pontifices & reges differentia cognoſcatur. To the Firmament of heauen, that is of the vniuerſall church, God made two lights, pontificall authoritie, and power royall: that we may know there is as much difference betweene Popes and Kings, as there is between the Sunne and the Moone. The gloſſe ſetteth downe preciſely, how farre a King is inferiour to a Pope, that is, to any Biſhop of Rome, in theſe words; *Reſtat, vt pontificalis dignitas, quadrageſies ſepties ſit maior regali dignitate.* It remaineth, that the dignitie of the Pope, is fortie times ſeuen times greater than the power of the King. *Gloſſ. ibid.*

Now touching the kiſſing of the Popes ſecte, I anſwere, that ſome Chriſtian Kings & Emperors vpon a blind zeale not grounded in knowledge, humbling themſelues to the Biſhop of Rome, and yeelding vp their ſouereigne rights to him, opened the window to all antichriſtian tyrannie. For in ſhort time after, (as is alreadie prooued) the Romiſh Biſhops became ſo lordly and inſolent, that they tooke vpon them to depoſe the Emperours, to tranſlate their Empires, and to diſpoſe at their pleaſures of their royall Scepters and Regalities. Much more might be ſaid in this matter, but for that the Pope hath made it ſacriledge to diſpute of this, I will here onely tell thee gentle Reader, what the Popes deere Frier *Sigebertus* hath written of his holineſſe. Theſe are his expreſſe words; *Vt pace omnium bonorum dixerim, hæc ſola nouitas, non dicam hæreſis, nondum in mundo emerſerat, vt ſacerdotes illius, qui regnare facit hypocritam propter peccata populi, doceant populum quod malis regibus nullam debeant ſubiectionē, & licet ei ſacramētum fidelitatis fecerint, nullam tamen debeant fidelitatem, nec periuri dicantur, qui contra regem ſenſerint; imò qui regi pannerit, pro excommunicato habeatur; qui contra regem fecerit, noxa iniuſtitiæ & periurij abſoluatur.* To ſpeake by the fauour of all good men, this ſole noueltie, I will not ſay hereſie, was not yet known in the world; that his prieſts who maketh an hypocrite *Sigebert. in anno, 1088.*

to reigne for the sinnes of the people, should teach the people, that they owe no subiection to wicked kings, and that although they haue taken the oth of fealtie, yet do they owe them no allegeance, neither are they periured that thinke ill against the king: yea, he that obeyeth the king, is this day reputed an excommunicate person; and he that taketh part against the king, is absolued from the crime of iniustice and periurie.

This is our very case (gentle reader) this day in England, so liuely painted out in best beseeming coulours, as if the writer had bene liuing euen now amongst vs. So then, wee haue to obserue heere for our instruction, That the Popes owne Monkes and Friers haue thought as ill of the Popes dealings in former times, as we thinke of his proceedings in these latter dayes: As also, That popish religion hath alwaies been condemned, euen of great learned Papists that liued in the Popes Church. Whereof none can be ignorant, that will seriously peruse my bookes of Motiues and Suruey. And this shall suffice for the first article: to which (if their hearts doe not faint them, or their consciences condemne them) the Papists will frame some answere vndoubtedly.

Answere ô papists if you can: if not, repent for shame.

The

The ſecond Article, touching the erroneous doctrine of the Popiſh Maſſe.

The firſt member. Of the impoſſibilitie of their ſuppoſed reall preſence.



Quinas, the Ieſuit *Bellarmine*, the Councell of Trent, *Melchior Canus*, *Ioſephus Anglus*, and the reſt of the Romiſh brood, hold conſtantlie as an article of their chriſtian faith, That the true, organicall and naturall bodie of Chriſt Ieſus, which was borne of the Virgin *Marie*, which was crucified and nayled on the Croſſe, which roſe againe the third day from death, and is circumſcriptiuely and locally in heauen; is alſo truely, really, and ſubſtantially, vnder the forme of bread and wine, in the ſacrifice of the popiſh maſſe. But this is impoſſible, as which implieth flat contradiction; and conſequently, late romiſh religion conſiſteth of impoſſibilities, falſhoodes, and contradictions. The doubt hereof is onely in the aſſumption; for proofe whereof, I ſet downe this ſuppoſall with our Cardinall *Bellarmine*, *viz.* That we are not bound to beleeue any thing which implyeth contradiction. And becauſe I will proceede ſincerely, yee ſhall heare his owne words: thus doth hē write; *Neq́, fides noſtra ad id nos obligat, vt ea defendamus, quæ euidēter implicāt contradictionem.* Neither doth our faith binde vs ſo, that we muſt defend thoſe things which implie euident contradiction. But ſo it is, that the popiſh imaginarie being of Chriſts bodie in a

Conc. trid. ſeſſ. 3. can. 1. Aquin. 3. p. q. 76. art. 1. Ioſeph. Anglic. in 4. 1. p. q. 4. de eucha. Bellar. de euch. lib. 1. cap. 2. col. 468. B.

Bellar. de eucha. lib. 3. cap. 19. col. 748. A.

little round cake, implieth in it selfe euident contradiction, and cannot possibly be brought to passe. For example, no power vpon earth or in heauen, can bring to passe that a bodie being three cubits long and one cubit broad, remaining still so long and so broad, shall be contained in another bodie of two cubits length, and halfe a cubite breadth. The reason hereof is euident, because so to containe and be so contained, implieth flat contradiction. And this is the case now in controuersie, concerning Christs supposed being in the round popish cake. For if Christs naturall and organicall bodie be there, as popish faith auoucheth: then must the Papists beleeue euident contradictions, contrarie to Iesuit *Bellarmines* resolution; yea, contrarie to all power, all Logicke, all reason. All the Papists in England are not able to solue this reason. I challenge them all, and aduise them to consult together, and to craue help of their friends elsewhere, and then to let me haue their speedie answere hereunto.

Aquin, 3. p. q. 76. ar. 4. contra.

Apud Ioseph. Angles, in 4. sect. 1. p. pag. 144.

Cardinall *Caietane* affirmeth boldly, that no text in the whole Gospell doth prooue effectually, and conuince the reader to vnderstand these words properly (This is my bodie.) For which respect frier *Ioseph* aduiseth gratuely, to reade their Cardinall (*caute*) warily.

Aquinas, in 4. s. d. 10. q. 2. ar. 1.

Aquinas affirmeth constantly, *Corpus Christi non esse in pluribus locis simul, secundum proprias dimensiones*; that Christs bodie is not in many places at once, according to the proper dimensions thereof: whose assertion is my flat position. For Christs naturall bodie cannot be without those dimensions which naturally pertaine vnto it. *Durandus* holdeth the very same opinion.

Aug epist. ad Dardan. in fine.

S. *Austine* saith plainely, that Christs true bodie can be but in one onely place of heauen. *Vbi totum presentem esse non dubites tanquam deum, & in eodem templo dei esse tanquam inhabitantem deum, & in loco aliquo cœli propter veri corporis modum.* Thou must not doubt (saith S. *Austen*) that Christ is wholly present euery where as God, and in the same temple of God, as God inhabiting it, and in some one place of

of heauen, for the manner of a true bodie. Lo, this graue father telleth vs, that Christ as God is euery where; but yet in respect of his true bodie, hee is onely in heauen, and in some certaine place of heauen. Only in heauen, because the Scripture saith, That he shall be there till the worlds end, in some certaine place of heauen, to declare the nature and veritie of a true bodie indeed. So then, if he were present as the Papists would haue him, his bodie should lose the nature and veritie of a true bodie indeed.

Againe in another place S. *Austen* hath these words; *Donec seculum finiatur, sursum est dominus, sed tamen etiam hic nobiscum est veritas domini; corpus enim in quo resurrexit, in vno loco esse oportet; veritas autem eius vbique diffusa est.* Our Lord is aboue vntill the worlds end, but yet his truth is with vs here; for the bodie of our Lord, wherein he rose againe, must needs be in one place; but this truth is diffused euery where. *Aug. de consecr. dist. 2. can. prima quidem.*

Againe, the same S. *Austen* writing against *Faustus* the Manichee, hath these expresse words: *Secundum presentiam corporalem, simul & in Sole, & in Luna, & in cruce esse non posset.* According to his corporall presence, it was not possible for him to be both in the Sunne, and in the Moone, and on the crosse, at one and the same time. O Papists, answere if you can; if not, recant for shame. *Aug. contr. Faust. lib. 20. ca. 11. to. 6.*

The second Member. Of the Sacrifice of the Popish Masse.

THe Papists teach and beleeue as an article of Christian faith, That in their Masse Christs true and reall bodie is truly and really sacrificed to God the Father, vnder the forme of bread, as also his true and reall bloud vnder the forme of wine. Yet this implieth horrible impietie and brutish crueltie, as shall be prooued: and consequently, popish Masse is to be abhorred. *Conc. trid. sess. 6. can. 2. & 17. sep. Bellar. lib. 1. cap. 12. Aquin. 3. p. q. 82. art. 4.*

Rom.6,v.9. Firſt, where the Apoſtle telleth vs, that Chriſt riſing againe from the dead, henceforth dieth no more, becauſe death hath no more dominion ouer him; the Papiſts tell vs a contrarie tale, that Chriſt dieth euery day, nay, a thouſand times a day, in the daily ſacrifice of their Maſſe; for with them all Prieſts (the Pope, Cardinals, and ſome others excepted) doe ordinarily ſay Maſſe euery day, and three Maſſes vpon euery Chriſtmas day. Which being ſo, and three hundred Ieſuits and Seminarie Prieſts being this day in England and Scotland, as the Ieſuites tell vs; an huge multitude of Maſſes muſt be ſaid daily in theſe realmes, and many times muſt Chriſt be put to death, ſo farre forth as in them lieth, though they pretend to honour him thereby.

Note this reaſon. For, as Cardinall *Bellarmine* graunteth freely, a ſacrifice implieth intrinſecally, the conſumption of the thing that is ſacrificed. I will not auouch any vntruth vpon any man (gentle reader) theſe are his owne words: *Sacrificium enim preter oblationem, requirit mutationem, & conſumptionem rei quæ offertur.* For, ſaith *Bellarmine*, a ſacrifice beſides the oblation, requires an alteration and a conſumption of the thing which is offered.

Bellar. de miſſa, lib.1.cap.2. col 957.

Vbi ſup. col. 697. Againe, *Bellarmine* in another place telleth vs, that the bodie and bloud of Chriſt are offered in the Maſſe, *verè & propriè*, truly and properly, vnder the formes of bread and wine.

Vbi ſup. col. 1015. Againe, *Bellarmine* ſaith in another place, that fleſh and bloud are not fit for meat, *niſi prius animal moriatur*, vnleſſe the beaſt firſt die (and be ſlaine.)

Bellar. de miſſa, lib.1. cap. vlt. Againe, the ſame *Bellarmine* teacheth the ſame doctrine, yet more plainely in another place. Thus doth he write: *Sacrificium enim verum & reale, veram & realem occiſionem exigit, quando in occiſione ponitur eſſentia ſacrificij.* For a true and reall ſacrifice requireth a true and reall killing, ſeeing that the eſſence of the ſacrifice conſiſteth in the killing thereof. And in very deede, this is that conſtant doctrine which S. *Paule* doth inculcate to the Hebrewes.

Hebr.9.v.17, 25,26,27,28.

So

So then, we ſee it cleare and euident by popiſh faith and doctrine, that Ieſus Chriſt our ſweet redeemer, muſt firſt be killed, then offered, laſtly torne and conſumed by the teeth of the ſacrificing maſſe-prieſt; or els the popiſh maſſe cannot be perfect, as their moſt perfect doctor telleth vs.

For confirmation of this popiſh doctrine, it is a conſtant poſition and generally receiued axiome in the popiſh church, that by vertue of their conſecratorie words, Chriſts bodie is put apart from his bloud, and his bloud apart from his bodie; and ſo Chriſt is there ſlaine by force of their conſecration, though he ſtill liue indeed, becauſe the Prieſts words haue not ſo much force as they imagin. You ſhall heare *Bellarmines* owne words; *Nam inprimis ideo in cœna ſeorſim conſecratur corpus, & ſeorſim ſanguis, vt intelligamus præſentiam corporis & ſanguinis in cœna, eſſe ad modum occiſi & mortui corporis.* For firſt therefore is the bodie conſecrate apart in the ſupper, and the bloud aſunder, that we may vnderſtand the preſence of the bodie and bloud in the ſupper, to be there after the manner of a bodie ſlaine and dead. Theſe are his words, and this which he thus deliuereth, is the conſtant doctrine of the Popiſh Church. Whereupon it followeth of neceſſitie, that if any Papiſt ſhould haue ſaid Maſſe, *in triduo mortis Chriſti*, during Chriſts death; then Chriſts bodie by vertue thereof ſhould haue been dead in one place, and his bloud in another place: for otherwiſe, Chriſt ſhould haue been both quicke and dead at once, which implieth contradiction. *Aquinas* graunteth this illation, theſe are his words: *Ideo ſi in illo triduo mortis fuiſſet hoc ſacramentum celebratum, non fuiſſet ibi anima Chriſti.* Therefore during Chriſts death, if this ſacrament had been celebrated, the ſoule of Chriſt ſhould not haue been in it.

Bellar. de miſſa, lib. 1. ca. 12. col. 1015. a.

Aquin. 3. p. q. 76. art. 1.

Secondly, if this popiſh kind of doctrine were true, theſe abſurdities and groſſe impieties muſt perforce follow hereupon, *viz.* that Chriſt the night before he was crucified, was both ſitting at the table, and borne in his owne hands,

handes, both liuing and dead, both visible and inuisible, both long and short, both broad and narrow, both light and heauie; that he was a sacrifice for our sinnes, before he died for our sinnes,; that his sacrifice was either vnperfect in the former oblation in his last supper, or els that it was needlesse in his bitter immolation vppon the Altar of
Hebr.9.v.27. the crosse. For as the Apostle telleth vs, Christ was not to offer himselfe often, as the high Priest did, but once to the destruction of sinne, by the sacrifice of himselfe. These are his words, as the Papists (our English Rhemists I meane) haue put them downe; and as it is appointed to men to die once, and after this the iudgement: so also Christ was offered once, to exhaust the sinnes of many. Loe, Christ died but once; and that one oblation was sufficient to take away all sinnes in the world. The word (exhaust) which the Rhemists vse, doth significantly expresse so much. But the words of S. *Paul* in another place are most manifest, and doe plainely conuince this truth:
Hebr.10.v.10 In the which will (saith S. *Paule*) we are made holy, euen by the offering of the bodie of Iesus Christ once for all.
ibid.v.12. Againe thus: But this man, after hee hath offered one sacrifice for sinnes, is set downe for euer on the right hand
ibid.v.14. of God. Againe in these wordes: For with one offering hath hee made perfect for euer them that are sanctified. Loe, gentle Reader, Christ, saith Christs Apostle, made but one oblation: Christ, say the Papists, hath made many, and still maketh moe oblations. Christ, saith Christs Apostle, died but once on the Crosse: Christ, say the Papists, dieth euerie day in the Masse. Christ, saith Christs Apostle, made perfect, finished, and consummated mans redemption, with one onely sacrifice. Christ, say the Papists, doth perfect and consummate his, with the dayly sacrifice of the masse. Now, whether Christs Apostle, or our Papists be of better credit, let the indifferent Reader iudge.
Luk 22.v.20. Thirdly, the Cup is the newe Testament in my bloud
Hebr.9.v.17. saith Christ, which is shed for you. But a Testament is not of force without the death of the Testator, as S. *Paul* teacheth

cheth vs. And consequently either Christs bodie was not really offered in his supper, or at least it was a sacrifice of no force, value, or efficacie at all; for that it was not yet ratified by the death of the testator. Hereupon it followeth of necessitie, that when Christ saith in S. *Luke*, This cup is the new Testament in my bloud: and in S. *Mathew*, This is my bloud of the new Testament: the sence is all one, most plaine, and cleare, *viz.* that the Cup is a sacrament of the bloud of Christ, and of the new Testament confirmed thereby; but indeede is no more really the bloud of Christ it selfe, than it is really the new Testament it selfe. For the expresse mention of remission of sinnes, is referred to the bloud of Christ shed vpon the Crosse, and not to the sacrament of his bloud; seeing his bloud was not shed in his supper, but his bitter passion. *Luk.* 22. *v.* 20. *Mat.* 26. *v.* 28

Fourthly, the Apostle saith flatly, οὐκ ἔτι προσφορὰ περὶ ἁμαρτίας, there is not henceforth any oblation for sinne. But if S. *Paule* say truly, that there is no oblation for sinne, after Christs death on the Crosse; then doubtlesse the Papists must needes say falsely, that they haue a dayly propitiatorie Sacrifice in their popish Masse. Neither will it serue their turne to answere, that it is the selfe-same sacrifice of the Crosse, but offered in another manner; for if that were true, then should their Masse-sacrifice be of infinite value: which for all that, no Papist dareth auouch. Nay, *Bellarmine* saith in plaine tearmes: *Valor sacrificij missæ finitus est.* The value or worth of the Masse, is finit, not infinit. And yet, if the value of the Masse bee not infinit, then doubtlesse, that sacrifice cannot bee the sonne of God, for he is of infinit power, of infinit Maiestie, of infinit value. Yea, whosoeuer denieth Christs bodie and bloud, subsisting in the person of God by hypostaticall vnion, to be of infinite value, hee is become a flat Arrian, beleeuing Christ to be pure man, and not God. And consequently, the Papists, howsoeuer they thinke or speake of their Masse, yet in making it a sacrifice, they must perforce be blasphemous against the sonne of God. Again, *Bellarmine* *Hebr.* 10. *v.* 18 *Bellar. de miss. lib.* 2. *ca.* 4. *col.* 1076.

confesseth against himselfe vnawares, and against an article of popish faith, That their popish masse is not *verè & propriè*, truly and properly propitiarie: *Quod Christus non immortalis, nec mereri nec satisfacere potest.* Because, saith *Bellarmine*, Christ now being immortall, can neither merit nor satisfie. But I am well assured, that their holy late councell of Trent teacheth otherwise. These are the words: *Et quoniam in diuino hoc sacrificio, quod in missa peragitur, idem ille Christus continetur, & incruentè immolatur, qui in ara crucis semel seipsum cruentè obtulit, docet sancta synodus sacrificium istud verè propitiatorium esse.* And because in this diuine sacrifice which is made in the masse, that same Christ is contained, and offered vnbloudily, who on the altar of the crosse once offered himselfe bloudily, the holy councell teacheth it to be a propitiatorie sacrifice truly and indeed. Loe, how the Papists say and vnsay: one while it is truely a propitiatorie sacrifice; another while it cannot truly be so called. Well, the Pope hath allowed *Bellarmines* doctrine, and he hath also allowed the Councell; and yet wise men can see how they flatly disagree, and that in the highest point of their melodie.

Bellar. de missa. lib. 2. cap. 4 col. 1076.

Conc. trid. sess. 6. can. 2. & c. 17. sep.

Fiftly, the *Pope* owne decrees doe seale vp this truth against the *Pope*, these are his wordes: *Sicut ergo cœlestis panis qui Christi caro est, suo modo vocatur corpus Christi, cùm reuera sit sacramentum corporis Christi, illius viz. quod visibile, quod palpabile, mortale, in cruce positum est; vocatur & ipsa immolatio carnis quæ sacerdotis manibus fit, Christi passio, mors, crucifixio; non rei veritate sed significante mysterio; sic sacrum fidei quod baptismus intelligitur, fides est.* As therfore the heauenly bred, which is the flesh of Christ, is after it maner called the body of Christ, when indeed it is the Sacrament of Christs bodie, of that body which is visible, which is palpable, mortal, & nailed on the crosse: and that oblation of flesh which is made by the hands of the priest, is called *Christs* passion, death, crucifixion, not in the truth of the thing, but in a mysterie, which signifieth the thing: so the sacrament of faith, by which baptisme is vnderstood, is faith.

De consecrat. d. 2. can. hoc est.

Thus

Thus saith the text. Let vs now heare their owne glosse vpon the same text, these are the expresse words: *Cœleste sacramentum quod verè representat Christi carnem, dicitur corpus Christi, sed improprie, vnde dicitur suo modo, sed non rei veritate, sed significati mysterio: vt sit sensus, vocatur Christi corpus, id est, significatur.* The heauenly sacrament which representeth Christs flesh truly, is called the bodie of Christ, but vnproperly, wherefore it is said, *suo modo*, after it manner, but not in the truth of the thing, but in the mysterie of the thing signified: that this may be the sence, it is called Christs bodie, that is to say, it signifieth his bodie.

Out of these golden words, deliuered as God would haue it by the pens of papists, to the confusion of all papists, I note first, that the holy and blessed bread of the Eucharist or Lords supper, is called the bodie of Christ. Secondly, that it is also called the passion and death of Christ. Thirdly, that it is not Christs bodie truly, properly, and in the truth of the thing. Fourthly, that it is Christs body, as the sacrament of baptisme is faith. Fifthly, that it is not Christs bodie in truth, but in signification. Sixtly, that it is only called Christs bodie, because it is the sacrament of his body; as baptisme is called faith, being only the sacrament of faith. Seuenthly, that it is Christs bodie, *improprie, suo modo, significati mysterio*; improperly, after a sort, in the mysterie of the thing signified: which words must be well remembred and marked. Lastly, that it is said negatiuely, *non rei veritate:* it is not Christs bodie, in truth, in deede, or in the veritie of the thing. These words are the very vpshot of the controuersie, they can admit no solution. For if Christs bodie were in the sacrament really and substantially, with bodie, flesh, bloud, sinewes, bones, and quantitie, as the papists say and beleeue; then doubtlesse he should be there *in rei veritate*, in the truth of the thing, euen in that true bodie which was borne of the blessed Virgin, the true Mother of true GOD, and true man. Answere Papists, if ye can, or els come home, and yeeld to the truth for shame.

The third Member. Of the barbarous and plaine villanous proceeding against Berengarius, for deniall of the abouenamed popish sacrifice.

POpish decrees tell vs a long tale of one *Berengarius*, sometime Deacon of a Church in Gaunt, who held a doctrine surely grounded vpon the holy scriptures, but wholie opposite to the late popish faith; *viz.* That the bread and wine in the holy Eucharist, after Christs words vttered, which they call consecration; are onely the sacrament, and not the true bodie and blood of our Lord Iesus Christ; and that they cannot sensuallie or sensibly, (for so their owne word *sensualiter* signifieth) bee handled or broken with the hands of the priests, or torne with the teeth of the faithfull. For this opinion so setled vpon Gods word, as all the cursed Romish brood, are not able in truth to gainesay the same; Pope *Nicholas* with his Romish synod, did so cruelly proceed against the silie deacon, as he must needs either abiure and renounce the truth, or else betake himselfe to be burnt with popish fire and faggot out of hand. In regard whereof, the poore Deacon ouercome with humane frailtie, yeelded at least in shew of wordes, to their most wicked, cruell, and very barbarous, or rather villanous suggestion. Then the Pope and Councell set downe the forme of words, which he should pronounce, the summe whereof I haue alreadie alleaged: who as list may reade the words at large, in the place quoted in the margent. I omit the words, because they are long and tedious: onely I wish the reader to obserue seriously with me, (for this reason can neuer be answered till the worlds end) that it is an article of popish faith, (oh horrible blasphemie) That the true and reall body of the Sonne of God, which was borne of the virgin *Marie*, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father omnipotent and all sufficient, is torne in pieces with the teeth

De consecrat. dist. 2. can. Ego Berengarius.

teeth of the faithfull, and broken asunder with the hands of the Priest, in their idolatrous Masse. For these are the words of the popish synod; *Manibus sacerdotum frangi, & fidelium dentibus atteri.* Which words are so fully farced with blasphemie, and repugnant to the truth, that neither *Melchior Canus*, nor the popish glosse, nor *Bellarmine*, can tell how to shuffle vp the same, but with shame inough, they passe it ouer as they can. *Bellarmine*, who is as it were the Popes owne mouth, writeth in this manner; *Respondeo, nunquam fuisse quæstionem, an Christi corpus vere vt est in se, frangeretur manibus, & dentibus tereretur; certum enim est, & semper fuit, Christi corpus incorruptibile nunc existens, non posse frangi & teri, nisi in signo siue sacramento: sta vt dicatur frangi ac teri, cum signum eius, id est, species panis frangitur, & teritur.* I answere (saith the Iesuite) that question was neuer made, if the body of Christ as it is in it selfe, were truly broken with hands, and torne with teeth; for it is and euer was certaine and sure, that Christs bodie being now incorruptible, cannot be broken and torne, saue only in a signe or sacrament; so as it may be said to be broken and torne, when the signe thereof, that is to say, the forme of bread is broken and torne. *Bellar. de conc. lib. 2, cap. 8. d.*

Out of these words I note first, that by the Popes owne doctrine, (for the Iesuites doctrine is the doctrine of the Pope, seeing the Pope hath approoued it,) Christs bodie cannot be broken or torne, truely and indeede. I note secondly, that the Pope and his Councell decreed the contrarie doctrine, and that as an article of popish faith; when they compelled *Berengarius*, to confesse it with his mouth, and to beleeue it with his heart, and did also publish the same, *per vrbes Italiæ, Germaniæ, & Galliæ*, through the cities of Italie, France, and Germanie: for so saith the decree, *Ego Berengarius.* I note thirdly, that it is truely said, Christs bodie is broken; because the forme of the bread is broken, as popish doctrine teacheth vs. For we see heere, that this is all that the Papists can say for themselues: and vpon this strong foundation, and in-

uincible bulwarke, I inferre this golden and euident corollarie; *viz.* That if it be true to say, Christs bodie is broken and torne, because the signe of his bodie is broken and torne; then truely may wee say, and truelie doe we say, that Christs bodie is in the Eucharist, because the signe of his bodie is there, because the sacrament of his bodie is there, because the representation of his bodie is there. And much more truly might Christ himselfe say, This is my bodie, when he gaue the signe and sacrament of his bodie. I note fourthly, that it is the constant doctrine of the church of England (which also many other reformed churches approoue therein) that Christs bodie is receiued, broken, torne, and consumed with mouth and teeth, figuratiuely, significantly, mystically, sacramentally. And consequently, if the Papists would be iudged by this doctrine, which by the pen of the Iesuit *Bellarmine* they heere deliuer, the controuersie would soone be at an end. But I must needs tell the reader, what the Popes owne glosse teacheth vs: it is singular and worthie to be noted, these are the words, *Nisi sane intelligas verba Berengarij, in maiorem incides hæresim, quam ipse habuit; & ideo omnia referas ad species ipsas, nam de corpore Christi partes non facimus*. Vnlesse thou vnderstand the words of *Berengarius* soundly, thou shalt fall into a greater heresie than he had; and therefore thou must referre all things to the formes, for of Christs bodie wee make no parts. Marke these words, gentle reader, for they are important: They teach vs plainely, that it is a most dangerous thing to relie vpon popish decrees, euen then when they pretend to reforme the Church, and to condemne heresies.

Gloss. de Conf. dist. 2 cap. ego Berengarius.

S. *Austen* confirmeth the doctrine, which the Pope compelled *Bellengarius* to abiure, and that in many places of his workes; one onely assertion I will now set downe. These are his words: *Illi manducabant panem dominum; ille, panem domini contra dominum.* They (the other Apostles) are the bread, that was the Lord, he (*Iudas*) ate (not our Lord, but) the bread of our Lord, against our Lord.

Aug. in Ioan. tract. 59.

Note

Note these wotds, gentle Reader, and marke them seriously. Saint *Austen* telleth vs, that the bread which the other Apostles ate, was our Lord; yet that which *Iudas* receiued, was but the bread of the Lord. This assertion confoundeth the Papists. For, if our Lord and maker be present really, in flesh, bloud, and bone, vnder the accidents of bread; and that so long as the same accidents remaine vncorrupt, as the popish faith holdeth: then doubtlesse *Iudas* should haue receiued his redeemer; then perforce *Iudas* should also haue receiued *panem dominum*; then *Iudas* could not by any possibility haue barely receiued *panem domini*, which yet S. *Austen* affirmeth most constantly. For first, if it were true, that after popish supposed consecration, the substance of bread were transubstantiated into Christs naturall bodie, as it truly consisteth of flesh, bloud, and bone: and againe, if it were also true, that the selfesame bodie remained vnder the forme of bread, vntill it were corrupted, then let all the Papists in England, with the best aduise of all their adherents and brother papists elsewhere in Europe, tell me how *Iudas* could receiue (*panem domini*) the bread of our Lord, and not *panem dominum*) the bread which is the Lord, as S. *Austen* plainely auoucheth, that is, how *Iudas* could receiue the forme, with the flesh, bloud, and bones, of Christs organicall and naturall bodie hidden vnder the same; and for all that, not receiue Christ himselfe, and *panem dominum*, as the other Apostles did. Let them I say, tell me this, and I herewith promise to subscribe, and neuer henceforth to write against them or any part of their popish doctrine. If they will not this doe, because they cannot (for if they can doe it, all the world must thinke they will doe it, for their owne credit, and the credit of their cause) then doubtlesse, if the feare of God be before their eyes, they will acknowledge the truth, and with open mouth confesse the same. *Corde enim creditur ad iustitiam, & ore confessio fit ad salutem.* Rom. 10. v. 10.

The

The fourth Member. Of the apparent contradictions in the Popish masse.

FIrst, the Papists tell vs, that Christs bodie in their Masse, is the selfe same bodie that was nayled on the Crosse. And withall they tell vs, that it is a figure of the same bodie. That it is a flat contradiction, their owne dere Cardinall *Bellarmine* shall tell them: These are his words: *Figuræ necessario, inferiores esse debent rebus figuratis.* Figures of necessitie, must needs be inferiour to the things figured by them. And this doctrine is most true indeede, as Saint *Paul* discourseth to the Hebrewes. Now would I know of the Papists, if they can say ought for the life of their masse, how Christs bodie in the masse being the selfe same bodie *numero*, as they teach and beleeue, can be inferiour to Christs bodie on the Crosse; how it can be both inferiour and superiour to it selfe; how it can be both of greater and lesser value than Christs body on the crosse, being euer the selfesame bodie on the crosse.

Bellar. de Eucharist. lib. 1. cap. 3. col 474.

Heb. 10.

Secondly, the Papists tell vs, that Christs naturall bodie is contained in a little round cake, or vnder the accidents and forme of bread. Now would I know of the same Papists, how the bigger can be contained of the lesser, how a bushell can be couched in a pecke, how a great Oxe can be closed vp in little Calues bellie. For all these implie euident contradiction.

Thirdly, the Papists tell vs, that Christs bodie is truely broken. For these are the Iesuit *Bellarmines* words: *Denique in concilio Romano sub Nicholao 2. compulsus est Berengarius confiteri, Christi corpus sensualiter sacerdotum manibus tangi & frangi.* Finally, in a counsell at Rome vnder Pope *Nicholas* the second, *Berengarius* was compelled to confesse, that Christs bodie is sensually touched and broken with the Priests hands.

Bellar. de Eucharist. lib. 1. cap. 2. col. 472.

Now would I know, how it can bee true, that Christs bodie

bodie is broken, and alſo true, that it is not broken, ſpeaking of the ſame bodie at the ſame time. Let all papiſts anſwere, and tell me if they can, how it implieth not contradiction. For to ſay, that not the bodie but the accident of bread is broken, is too too childiſh and friuolous. The reaſon is euident, becauſe *Berengarius* (ô cruell impietie) was compelled to confeſſe, that Chriſts bodie was ſenſually broken.

Fourthly, the Papiſts tell vs, that the pronouncing of theſe words by a Prieſt (This is my bodie) doe make Chriſts bodie preſent in their Maſſe, and alſo in other places: inſomuch (marke well gentle Reader what I ſay) that if a popiſh prieſt come into a great market place, where there is great ſtore of wheate bread, though a thouſand or moe loaues in number, and there looking on the bread, ſhall pronounce the ſayd wordes, with intention to conſecrate, then forthwith euerie loafe is God almightie, and the people muſt adore the ſame. Tryall hereof was once made *de facto* in Italie, as my ſelfe being in Rome, heard from the mouth of a Ieſuit. For, as the Ieſuit reported, a prieſt being degraded and deſigned to die, as he paſſed in the ſtreete by a Bakers houſe, beheld a great quantitie of wheat bread, recited theſe wordes (*Hoc eſt corpus meum*) and told the people, that hee had conſecrated the ſayd bread. Whereupon conſultation was had out of hand among the learned, and ſentence giuen, that euerie loafe was God almightie: and the bread was caried away with great ſolemnitie, reuerence, and ſuch adoration as was due to the ſonne of the euerliuing God. Now would I know, when the prieſt hath pronounced three of the ſai words, *viz.* (*hoc eſt corpus*) what is become of the bread afore him. For if they anſwere, that it is Chriſts bodie: then will it follow to their ſhame, that one of the wordes of their conſecration is of no force; which to die for it, the Papiſts may not admit. If they ſay, that a part of Chriſts bodie is then wrought really, by vertue of the ſayd words, then will it follow to their greater ſhame, that Chriſts bodie

this is a great wonderment, and extreame popiſh follie.

die is really torne in pieces, by force of their bloodie and moſt cruell maſſe. If they ſay, that nought is indeed effected, vntill the laſt ſillable of the laſt word be pronounced; then will it follow to their confuſion, that of foure words wherein conſiſteth their whole conſecration, three are of no vertue, force, or efficacie, but ſtand as cyphers to fill vp the place, and to make a ſhew of that which is not.

Fiftly, *Durandus* telleth vs, that onely the forme of bread is changed, and that the matter of bread remaineth ſtill in the Euchariſt. *Rupertus* the popiſh Abbot holdeth, that the bread is vnited hypoſtatically to the ſonne of God. *Caietanus*, *Henricus*, and *Capreolus*, are of another opinion: *Iohannes Pariſienſis* held alſo that the bread was aſſumpted, but in a different manner from the opinion of *Rupertus*. Another opinion, affirmeth the annihilation of the bread: but the Ieſuit *Bellarmine* holdeth with their Councell of Trent, that the bread is tranſubſtantiated into the bodie of Chriſt.

Sixtly, the Papiſts tell vs, that when the prieſt is at maſſe, then all ſpectators muſt adore that which hee holdeth ouer his head, and conſtantly beleeue it to bee their maker and redeemer of the world: and if any hold contrarie opinion, or teach the contrarie doctrine, that perſon muſt be burnt with fire and faggot for his paines. But yet for all this the popiſh faith telleth vs, that if euer the Prieſt want intention to conſecrate, (which often chaunceth, or at leaſt may chaunce, by reaſon of wandering imaginations) or of purpoſe meaneth not to conſecrate, or of negligence omitteth, or miſcalleth any word of conſecration; then by popiſh doctrine, faith, and religion, the thing adored for God almightie, is but pure Bakers bread; and conſequently, the adorers thereof become idolaters, worſhipping a piece of bread for the euerliuing God.

Seuenthly, the Papiſts tell vs, that many Prieſts are appointed at once to pronounce the words of conſecration,

in

in the Romish Church Lateran when they are made priests. But they cannot tell vs, how many gods, or how many times God is made in one and the same piece or cake of bread, in and at that masse of the newlie made priests. For they are all appointed to consecrate, they doe all pronounce the wordes, they are all bounden to haue intention, and they all haue the fit and requisite matter to worke vpon: but when the principall actor and chiefe agent, to wit, the Bishop, is at the last syllable; then some of the rest be in the middest, some toward the end, some in one place, some in an other, neuer one iumping with other in that instant, in which they should their bread-god make. For of this dreadfull mysterie, there are three solemne dissonant opinions. Pope *Innocentius* holdeth, that they all doe consecrate: *Durandus* auoucheth, that that priest onely consecrateth, which with greatest speed first commeth to the end: but Cardinall *Caietanus* hath a different consideration. Now would I know, how these so different popish opinions, in a matter of so great importance, can be reconciled and salued from contradiction. Answere papists if you can, or else relent and yeeld to the truth for shame.

Ioseph. Angl. in 4. s. pag. 180

The

The third Article. Of po-

piſh diſpenſations.



Antoninus, 3. par. tit. 22. cap. 5. §. 8.

Ntoninus ſometime Archbiſhop of Florence, comming as Ambaſſadour from the Pope, telleth vs, if we may beleeue him, that the Pope is Chriſts vicar vpon earth, and hath equall power with God Almightie. Theſe are his owne expreſſe words; *Cum autem vicarius Chriſti ſit Papa, nullus poteſt ſeipſum ſubtrahere ab obedientia eius de iure, ſicut nullus de iure poteſt ſe ſubtrahere ab obediẽtia Dei. Et ſicut recepit Chriſtus à patre ducatũ & ſceptrum eccleſiæ gentium ex* Iſrael *egrediens, ſuper omnem principatum & poteſtatem, & ſuper omne quodcunq; eſt, vt ei genua curcta curuentur; ſic ipſe* Petro *& ſucceſſoribus eius, plenitſſimã poteſtatẽ commiſit.* For ſeeing the Pope is the vicar of Chriſt, none can lawfully withdraw himſelfe from his obedience, as none can lawfully withdraw himſelfe from Gods obedience. And as Chriſt receiued of his father the dukedome and ſcepter of the Church of the Gentiles ariſing of *Iſrael*, ouer all principalitie and power, and aboue euery thing that hath being, that to him euery knee may bend: euen ſo Chriſt hath cõmitted moſt full power to *Peter* and his ſucceſſors.

Aug. de Anch. in ſumma, pag 152.

The famous popiſh frier, *Auguſtinus de Ancona*, in that booke which he dedicated to Pope *Iohn* the twelft of that name, ſingeth the ſame ſong, and affirmeth the Pope to haue the ſame power. Theſe are his expreſſe words; *(Papa) tanquam vicarius Dei filij cæleſtis imperatoris, iuriſdictionem habet vniuerſalem ſuper omnia regna & imperia.* The Pope, as he that is the vicar of the ſonne of God the heauenly Emperour,

perour, hath vniuersall iurisdiction ouer all kingdoms and empires. Many other papists haue the like testimonies, but they are needlesse, seeing the Pope is a sufficient witnes against himselfe, hauing often reduced their assertions to actuall execution. For the Pope hath often by his wicked and execrable dispensations taken vpon him to dissolue that matrimonie which is firme and stable by Christs owne institution. The former part is prooued by their learned canonist *Martinus Nauarrus*, in these expresse words: *Diuiditur (matrimonium) ante consummationem, per dispensationem papæ iusta de causa factam.* Matrimonie is dissolued before consummation, by the Popes dispensation vpon iust cause graunted. Now to prooue that the Pope may this doe, *Nauarre* taketh it for a good ground, that the Pope hath practised the same. Thus doth he write: *Quorum opinio adeo obseruatur, quod etiam ter vel quater ad petitiones consilio meo antequam in vrbem venissem oblatas, Paulus 3. & Pius 4. per suas dispensationes, dissoluerunt quædam matrimonia omnino clandestina nondum consummata, in remedium animarum aliquin probabiliter perituraru.* Whose opinion (he speaketh of the Canonists) is so obserued, that three or foure times before my comming to Rome, vpon petitions made by mine aduise, Pope *Paulus* the third, and Pope *Pius* the fourth, with their dispensations dissolued certaine secret matrimonies not yet cõsummate, for the safegard of soules, which by likelyhood would otherwise haue perished.

Nauar. in Enchar. cap. 22. par. 21.

Nauar. vbi sup.

And another famous popish Canonist *Couarruvias* affirmeth, that Pope *Paulus* the fourth and *Iulius* the third dispensed in like manner. These are his words: *Nec me latet Paulum quartum summum ecclesiæ pontificem, anno 1558. hac vsum fuisse dispensatione quibusdam ex causis, quas iustissimas esse idem summus ecclesiæ præsul existimauit. Idem Paulo ante Iulius tertius fecerat in eodem matrimonio, cum ecclesiæ vniuersali præsiderit.* Neither am I ignorant, that Pope *Paul* the fourth put this dispensation in practise, for certaine causes which the same Pope thought to be most iust. *Iulius* the third, when he was Pope, in like case graunted the like dis-

Couar. to. 1. cap. 7. par. 4. n. 13. col. 1.

penſation. Thus we ſee the former part of mine aſſertion to be moſt ſufficiently prooued, *viz.* that the Pope taketh vpon him to diſſolue lawfull and perfect matrimony. Now for proofe of the latter, *viz.* that wedlocke before conſummation or copulation, is firme and perfect, and cannot be diſſolued by the power of man: Chriſts owne words are a ſufficient ground. *Quod deus coniunxit, homo non ſeparet.* That which God hath conioyned, let no man put aſunder. And in another place Chriſt hath theſe words: *Omnis qui dimittit vxorem ſuam, & alteram ducit, mœchatur.* Euery one that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adulterie.

Matth. 19. v. 7.

Luke. 16. v. 18.

1. Cor. 7. v. 10. S. *Paule* vpon the ſame argument deliuereth the like doctrine in theſe words: *His autem qui matrimonio iuncti ſunt precipio non ego, ſed dominus, vxorem à viro non diſcedere; quod ſi diſceſſerit, manere inuptam, aut viro ſuo reconciliari, & vir vxorem non dimittat.* Thoſe that are married commaund not I, but the Lord, that the wife depart not from her husband: but if ſhe ſhall depart, then to abide vnmarried, or to be reconciled to her husband.

Thus ſaith S. *Paul*, and thus ſaith Chriſt himſelfe, that man and wife ioyned by Chriſt, muſt abide during life together; or liue vnmarried, and not to be ſeuered by the Popes diſpenſation.

And it will not help the Pope to ſay as the Ieſuit *Bellarmine* doth, and others with him, That Chriſt only ſpeaketh *de matrimonio conſummato*, and that *matrimonium ratum*, with which the Pope diſpenſeth, is not *de iure diuino*.

For firſt, if *matrimonium ratum* were not *de iure diuino*, the greateſt popiſh Doctors would not denie the Popes diſpenſation therein.

Secondly, Chriſt ſpeaketh abſolutely, and maketh no mention of copulation, or popiſh conſummation at all.

Thirdly, matrimonie with papiſts is a diuine ſacrament, and conſequently, it both is perfect without carnall copulation, and alſo indiſpenſable by the power of man. For as their own famous doctor *Melchior Canus* ſaith, *Sanctus ſpiritus*

Canus de locis, lib. 8. ca. 5. p. 246.

ritus & sacramenti gratia, per coitum non datur. The holy ghost & the grace of sacrament is not giuen by copulation.

Fourthly, it followeth hereupon, that matrimonie is not fully perfect in the popish Church, because copulation followeth a good while after.

Fiftly, because it is absurd to say, that it beginneth to be a sacrament by carnall copulation, and was not a sacrament by the priests action.

Sixtly, it followeth hereupon, that there was not perfect matrimonie betweene *Adam* and *Eue*, for their matrimonie was in the state of innocencie, and before all carnall copulation.

Seuenthly, because if matrimonie be not *de iure diuino*, euen before copulation, there is no cause why both parties agreeing together, may not release the bargaine, and quite dissolue the contract. For as the law saith, *Quisque potest suo iuri cedere.* Euerie man may yeeld vp his right: which thing, all, as well Canonists as Diuines, admit for good in *sponsalibus*.

Eightly, it followeth hereupon, that the marriage betweene the blessed Virgine and S. *Ioseph*, was not perfect matrimonie: for there doubtlesse wanted carnall copulation; but the Angell of God feared not to call her *Iosephs* wife. *Matth.1.*

S. *Ambrose* hath these words: *Non enim defloratio virginitatis facit coniugium, sed pactio coniugalis.* For not the deflouring of virginitie maketh wedlocke, but the coniugall couenant. *Ambros. de inst. virg. ca. 6.*

S. *Austens* iudgement herein is most cleere and euident. These are his words: *Cum igitur ipse narret, non ex concubitu Ioseph, sed ex Maria virgine natum Christum, vnde eum patrem eius appellat, nisi quia & virum Mariæ recte intelligimus sine commixtione carnis, ipsa copulatione coniugij.* When therfore he telleth vs, that Christ is not borne of *Iosephs* copulation, but of the Virgine *Marie*; vpon what ground doth he call him his father, but only for that we do rightly conceiue him to be *Maries* husband without the cómixtion of *August. de consens. euang. lib. 2. cap. 1. to. 4.*

flesh,

flesh, by the verie copulation of wedlocke.

Augustin. de nuptijs & concupisc. lib. 1. cap. 11, tom. 7.

The same Father writing to *Valerius*, discourseth of this matter at large, and among many other notable sentences setteth downe these wordes: *Quibus vero placuit, ex consensu ab vsu carnalis concupiscentiæ in perpetuum continere, absit vt inter illos vinculum coniugale rumpatur. Sequitur neque enim fallaciter ab angelo dictum est ad Ioseph, noli timere, accipere Mariam coniugem tuam.* They that were content by mutuall consent to abstaine for euer from the vse of carnall copulation, God forbid, that between them should be dissolued the bond of wedlocke. For the Angell did not speak deceitfully to *Ioseph*, when he willed him not to feare to take *Marie* his wife vnto him.

Thus wee see it cleere, that the Pope taketh vpon him that power and authoritie which is proper to God alone: for hee practically auoucheth (as I haue prooued by his owne deere Doctors) that his dispensations are of force to vnmarrie and put asunder those persons whom God himselfe hath ioyned together in holy wedlocke. And contrariwise (as I shall prooue vnto you) he practically hath taken vpon him to ioyne in wedlocke those persons, to whom God himselfe hath forbidden marriage. I will omit knowne examples, and alledge one only not knowne to many; which as it is rare and notorious, so is it able to prouoke all that heare it, to exclaime against the execrable practise of the Pope.

Antonin. 3. p. tit. 1. cap. 11. prope fin.

Antoninus, a man of no small credit (for he was an Archbishop of the popish stampe, and by the Pope reported for a Saint) hath these verie words: *Reperitur tamen papa Martinus quintus dispensasse cum quodam, qui contraxerat & consummauerat matrimonium cum quadam eius germana.* Neuertheless, it is knowne, that Pope *Martin* the fift did dispense with one who had contracted and consummate matrimonie with his owne naturall and full sister, of the same father and same mother, for so much the word (*Germana*) doth import. Behold here, gentle reader, the excellencie of holy Poperie: and if thou desirest more of such melodie

Fatetur Durandus olim papam dispensando errasse. lib. 4. sent. dist. 7. q. 4. in fine.

die, thou mayest find it in my Booke of Motiues. But this here is a sufficient antepast for all our English Iesuites and Iesuited popelings. None are so ignorant, but they know that onely God can giue licence to marrie a mans owne naturall sister. Answere Papists if ye can, or els yeeld vnto the truth for shame.

The fourth Article. Of originall concupiscence in the *regenerat*.

SAint *Paul* throughout the whole seuenth Chapter to the Romans, *Rom.7.* prooueth original concupiscence in the regenerate to be sinne. But the Papists cannot abide to heare this doctrine, they stop their eares *Psal.58.v.6.* against the charmer, though hee charme neuer so wisely. And why I pray you? because forsooth it ouerthroweth their holy so supposed iustifications, their inherēt purities, their mutual satisfactions, their condigne merits, their pharisaicall supererogations. And yet *Petrus Lombardus* their famous Master of sentences (whose Booke to this day is publickely read in their Schooles of Diuinitie) vtterly condemneth their damnable doctrine in this point. These are his expresse wordes: *Lombard. li. 3. sent. dist. 29.* *Secundum animas vero iam redempti sumus ex parte, non ex toto; à culpa, non à pœna, nec omnino à culpa, non enim ab ea sic redempti sumus, vt non sit, sed vt non dominetur.* But touching our soules, we are redeemed in part, not wholly, from the sinne, not from the paine, neither wholly from the sinne

or default. For we are not so redeemed from it, that it bee not (in vs) but that it rule not (ouer vs.) Thus writeth the worshipfull popish Master, our reuerend father *Lombard*: out of whose words we may gather with facilitie so much as will serue our turne against the Papists. For first he saith, we are redeemed in part, but not in the whole. Secondly, that we are not wholly redeemed from sinne. Thirdly, he telleth vs how we are redeemed from sinne, *viz.* that albeit sinne still remaine in vs, yet hath it not such dominion ouer vs, that it can enforce vs to consent thereunto. Loe this doctrine is not mine, but the flat doctrine of the Papists, which I learned of that great Papist, who for his learning was surnamed the Master of sentences, and to this day is publickly read in their Diuinitie schooles.

Now must the papists perforce either recant their doctrin, or els crie fire and faggot for their chiefe master.

Touching *S. Paule*, he sayth first in this manner: I my selfe with the minde serue the law of God, but with the flesh, the lawe of sinne. Out of these words I note first, that the Apostle speaketh of the regenerate throughout this whole Chapter, because he nameth himselfe, who was Gods chosen and elect vessell. For which respect, and the like expressed in the seuenth Chapter to the Romanes, *S. Austen* changed his opinion, and graunted S. *Paule* to speake here of the regenerate. I note secondly, that the elect and regenerate doe serue the lawe of sinne. I note thirdly, that the best liuers are so farre from meriting *ex condigno*, grace and glorie, that they deserue in rigour of iustice, eternall death, because death is the reward of sinne. Which for that *S. Austen* could not well digest at the first, he thought that *S. Paules* wordes were to be vnderstoode of the reprobate, and not of the elect and godly sort: but when hee had pondered the Apostles discourse and words more seriously, he changed his opinion. This is confirmed in the selfesame Chapter in these words: But I see another lawe in my members, rebelling against the law of my minde, and subduing me vnto the law of sinne, which is in my members. By these wordes it is euident, that albeit *S. Paule* were the Child of God, yet could he

Rom. 7. v. 25.

Aug. li. 1. retract. cap. 22. p. 23.

Rom. 7. v. 23.

not merite any thing in Gods sight: but rather in rigour of iustice prouoke Gods heauie displeasure against him: For where or what could be his merite, who was prisoner to the law of sinne? Againe, the same is confirmed in these words: For I do not the good which I would, but the euill which I would not, that doe I. Thus saith *S. Paule*. And doubtlesse, since he did the euill which he would not, he sinned, though he were regenerate: and in that he sinned, he was guiltie of damnation, because death is the stipend of sinne. For this cause gravely saith *S. Austen*: *Cum deus coronat merita nostra, nihil aliud coronat, quam munera sua*. When God crowneth our merites, he crowneth nothing els but his owne gifts. Againe, the same is confirmed in these words, For the law is spirituall, but I am carnall, sold vnder sinne. Thus saith *S. Paule* of himselfe. And yet it is most true, that one vnder the burthen of sinne can merite nothing saue hell fire and eternall paine. Againe, the same is confirmed in these words: If I do that I would not, then it is not I that doth it, but sinne that dwelleth in me. Loe S. *Paule* graunteth that to be sinne in himselfe, which yet himselfe consenteth not vnto. And that he speaketh of originall concupiscence, which remaineth in the regenerate after baptisme, it cannot be denied. And it will not serue the turne, to say as *Bellarmine* doth, *viz.* that originall concupiscence remaineth after baptisme, but is no sinne at all: and, that it is called sinne onely in this respect, because it prouoketh a man to sinne; as a mans writing is called his hand, because it is written with his hand. For first, their owne master *Petrus Lombardus* graunteth it to be sinne, euen as S. *Paule* doth. Secondly, it causeth man to serue the law of sinne, which seruice can neuer be but sinne. Thirdly, S. *Paule* saith, he doth that ill which he would not, and that which he doth hate. All which must needs be meant of sinne.

Rom. 7. v. 19.

August. epist. 105. pag. 301.

Rom. 7. v. 14.

Rom. 7. v. 20.

That concupiscence remaining after baptisme, is truly called sinne, the papists themselues confesse vnawares in a maine point of doctrine and setled ground of their reli-

gion. Marke well gentle reader what I shall deliuer in this behalfe.

God chose all in Christ that shall be saued before the foundation of the world: and likewise reprobated all both negatiuely and positiuely (that I may vse their schoole-tearmes:) but positiuely, for the foresight of originall sinne. For the proofe hereof, it will suffice to alledge the words of our papists at Rhemes, in their notes vpon the new Testament. Thus do they write: So likewise, God seeing all mankind, and euery one of the same, in a generall condemnation and masse of sinne in and by *Adam*, deliuereth some and not othersome. These are their own words: and that which they teach, is the common doctrine of the Romish church. Againe, the same Rhemists in the chapter afore quoted haue these words: by the same example of those twins, it is euident also, that neither nations nor particular persons be elected eternally, or called temporally, or preferred to Gods fauour before others by their owne merits: because God when he made choise and first loued *Iacob*, and refused *Esau*, respected them both as ill, and the one no lesse than the other guiltie of damnation for originall sinne, which was alike in them both. And therefore where iustly he might haue reprobated both, he saued of mercie one. This is that strong foundation, whereon the papists thinke predestination to be built: the which I willingly doe admit, as which will make good my position euen against themselues. For seeing as they grant. That God beholding all in a generall condemnation for originall sinne, saueth the elect of mercie, and iustly decreeth to condemne the reprobate for originall sinne: it followeth of necessity, that either some reprobate shall be saued, which the papists neither dare nor may auouch, or els that concupiscence remaining after baptisme, is sinne indeed, which is the doctrine I defend. The consequution and illation is euident. For if originall sinne be truly remitted in baptisme, and be not truly sinne in the baptised, then can none be iustly damned that are baptised: for how,

Rhemes test. in Rom. 9. v. 14.

Rhem. Rom. 9. v. 11.

Marke well this dilemma.

Iunò per alluuia, & propria sua peccata quid ni?

shall

ſhall they be iuſtly condemned, for that which is remitted? it cannot be. And to graunt that all baptiſed perſons ſhalbe ſaued, is moſt abſurd; neither can I thinke any papiſt ſo ſenſeleſſe, as to affirme the ſame. For to name one for all: their Pope *Boniface* the eight, who (as their owne deere frier *Caranza* ſaith) entred into the popedome as a foxe, reigned in it as a wolfe, and died in the end as a dog: is not I trow a ſaint in heauen; and yet muſt we thinke he was baptiſed, or els a terrible *væ vobis* will fall vpon our papiſts.

Caranza in ſumma concilio-rum, fol. 369.

Now becauſe the papiſts vſe to boaſt, that S. *Auſten* is on their ſide, I will prooue at large, that he defendeth this my doctrine heere deliuered: and that I purpoſe in God to doe ſo plainely and euidently, as none can ſtand in doubt thereof, that ſhall ſeriouſly ponder my diſcourſe.

The firſt place of Saint Auſten.

Sicut cæcitas cordis, quam ſolus remouet illuminator Deus; & peccatum eſt quo in deum non creditur; & pœna peccati, qua cor ſuperbum digna animaduerſione punitur: & cauſa peccati, cum mali aliquid eo cordis errore committitur; ita concupiſcentia carnis, aduerſus quã bonus concupiſcit ſpiritus, & peccatum eſt, quia inneſt illi inobedientia contra dominatũ mentis: & pœna peccati eſt, quia reddita eſt meritis inobedientis; & cauſa peccati eſt, defectione conſentientis, vel contagione naſcentis. Like as the blindneſſe of heart, which only God the illuminatour doth remooue, is ſinne, through which man beleeueth not in God; and the puniſhment of ſinne, wherewith a proud heart is iuſtly chaſtened; and the cauſe of ſinne, when through the blindneſſe of heart any euill is committed; euen ſo concupiſcence of the fleſh, againſt which the good ſpirit coueteth, is ſinne, becauſe there is in it diſobedience againſt the gouernment of the mind: and alſo a puniſhment of ſinne, becauſe it was rendred to the merits of the diſobedient: and it is alſo the cauſe of ſinne, by defection of him that conſenteth, or by contagion of the child that is borne.

Aug. lib. 5. cont. Iulian. cap. 3. tom. 7.

In these wordes, Saint *Austen* expresseth three things precisely; first, that concupiscence in the regenerate, is the punishment of sinne; secondly, that it is the cause of sinne; thirdly, that it is sinne it selfe. Which three, Saint *Austen* doth not onely distinguish, but withall he yeeldeth three seuerall reasons for the same: and that he speaketh of the regenerate, it is euident in this; because he speaketh of that concupiscence, against which the good spirit striueth. Most impudent therefore are the Papists, when they auouch with open mouth, that Saint *Austen* onely calleth it sinne, because it is the cause of sinne. And the gentle reader may heere also obserue, that Saint *Austen* compareth concupiscence of the flesh, with that blindnesse of heart which breedeth infidelity in man: which how great a sinne it is, euery one can tell.

The second place of Saint Austen.

Aug. contr. Iulian. lib. 6. cap. 8. tom. 7.

NEque enim nulla est iniquitas, cum in vno homine vel superiora inferioribus turpiter seruiunt; vel inferiora superioribus contumaciter reluctantur, etiam si vincere non sinantur. For it is some iniquitie, when in one man, either the superiour parts shamefully serue the inferiour; or the inferiour partes stubbornely striue against the superiour, although they be not suffered to preuaile.

These words of Saint *Austen* are so plaine, as the papists cannot possible inuent any euasion at all. For he saith in plaine and expresse tearmes; that the rebellion which is betweene the flesh and the spirit, is sinne; yea, that it is euen then sinne, when it is resisted, and cannot preuaile. At which time and in which respect, the papists will haue it to be merite, but no sinne at all. Behold a flat contradiction, it is sinne, saith Saint *Austen*: it is merite and no sinne, say the papists.

The third place of Saint Austen.

Augustin. de nuptiis & concup. lib. 1. cap. 25. to. 7.

SI in parente baptizato potest & esse & peccatum non esse, cur eadem ipsa in prole peccatum est? ad hæc respondetur, dimitti

mitti concupiscentiam carnis in baptismo, non vt non sit, sed vt in peccatum non imputetur. Sequitur, nun ergo aliquid remanet quod non remittatur, cum sit sicut scriptū est, propitius dominus omnibus iniquitatibus nostris; sed donec fiat & quod sequitur, qui sanat omnes languores tuos, qui redimet de corruptione vitā tuam: manet in corpore mortis huius carnalis concupiscentia. If concupiscence can both be in the baptised parent, & withall be no sin, why is the selfesame made sinne in the child? to this, this is the answere: that the concupiscence of the flesh is forgiuen in baptisme, not so that it remaine not, but so that it is not reputed for sin. Not any thing therefore remaineth, which is not forgiuen, seeing that is done which is written, God is mercifull to all our iniquities: but vntill that be done also which followeth: which healeth all thine infirmities; which redeemeth thy life from corruption; carnall concupiscence abideth in the bodie of this death. *Psal. 103. v. 3.*

It remaineth, sinne by nature, and so passeth by regeneration, from the parents to the children.

Saint *Austen* in these wordes sheweth plainely, that concupiscence remaineth as well in the baptised parent, as in the vnbaptised child; yet with this difference, that it is sinne in the parent, though not for sinne imputed; but in the Child it both is sinne, and is also so reputed. And the Reader must not forget, that Saint *Austen* saith, Nothing remaineth which is not forgiuen. Hee doth not say, Nothing is sinne that remaineth: or thus, No sinne remaineth: but thus, Not any thing remaineth, which is not remitted. As if hee had sayd, sinne indeede remaineth still in the baptised, but shall not bee imputed to the faithfull. Marke well, gentle Reader, the phrase which Saint *Austen* here vseth. It is forgiuen that still remaineth, saith Saint *Austen*: or, not any thing remaineth, which is not forgiuen. Therefore hee must needes meane, that something remaineth which is sinne, though pardoned and not reputed sinne. For nothing hath neede of forgiuenesse, but that which is sinne indeed.

The fourth place of Saint Austen.

Ideo apostolus non ait facere bonū sibi non adiacere, sed perficere. multū enim boni facit, qui facit quod scriptū est: post cōcupiscentias. *Aug. de nupt. & concup. lib. 2. cap. 29.*

Piscentias tuas non eas; sed non perficit, quia non implet quod scriptum; non concupisces. The Apostle therefore saith not, that hee hath not power to doe good, but that hee cannot perfect that which is good. For he doth great good, who doth that which is written; Follow not thy lusts: but he doth not perfect his wel-doing, because he doth not fulfill that which is written, Thou shalt not lust.

Out of these words of Saint *Austen*, I note many memorable documents. First, that Saint *Austen* speaketh these wordes of the regenerate; for they onely can doe this good, whereof the Apostle speaketh. Secondly, that though the regenerate can doe good, and striue against lust; yet can they not doe that good so perfectly, but it is alwayes annexed to sinne, and chayned with it, as with an heauie yokefellow. Thirdly, that the tenth commaundement (marke well my wordes) prohibiteth not onely actuall lust done with consent, but also originall lust committed without consent; and consequently, that concupiscence remaining in the regenerate, is sinne properly and formally. I proue it, because Saint *Paul* could not performe this precept, as Saint *Austen* truely and learnedly obserued: who for all that touching actuall sinne, was most free and innocent. For hee fought mightily against his raging concupiscence, and did in no wise yeeld thereunto. Hee was therefore guiltie by reason of originall concupiscence, which abode in him against his will. Therefore most absurd is the exposition of the Rhemists, who beare the Reader in hand, that Saint *Paul* speaketh not of the habituall concupisence, or sensuall desire and inclination to euill, when hee forbiddeth to lust. For if onely the consent of our reason and minde, to obey and to follow the lusts thereof, were sinne indeed; then should Saint *Austens* exposition be verie childish and too too absurd, who telleth vs plainely in expresse tearmes, That *S. Paul* could not fulfill that precept, although hee did not yeeld his consent vnto it, neither did obey or follow the desires thereof. No, no, Saint *Paul* had no such meanings; he

Rom. 7. v. 7.

hee named it sinne, as it is indeed. Hee saith, hee had not knowne lust to be sinne, except the law had sayd, Thou shalt not lust. But hee could neuer be ignorant, that concupiscence with consent was sinne; seeing the verie heathen men did know, and confesse the same. Againe, that actuall concupiscence which our Rhemists speake of, is forbidden in the sixt, seuenth, and eight Commaundements; as Christ himselfe expounded them. And consequently, the tenth commaundement forbiddeth, the very habituall and sensuall desire, or inclination to sinne, and the euill fruits thereof; that is, wicked, vicious, and iniurious thoughts, though we resist and striue against them. This is the expresse doctrine of Saint *Austen* in another place, which he deliuereth in these words; *Agit enim aliquid concupiscentia carnis, & quando non exhibetur ei vel cordis assensus, vbi regnet, vel membra velut arma, quibus impleatur quod iubet: agit autem quid, nisi ipsa desideria mala & turpia? Non enim si bona & licita essent, eis obedire prohiberet apostolus.* For concupiscence of the flesh worketh something, euen when there is not giuen vnto it, either the consent of the heart, where it may reigne; or the members as weapons, which may accomplish what it appointeth. And what doth it, but the verie wicked and filthie desires? For if they were good and lawfulll, the Apostle would not forbid to obey them.

Rom. 7. v. 7.

Matt. 5. v. 22.

Aug. de nupt. & concup. lib. 1. cap. 27.

Rom. 6. v. 12.

Marke these wordes, gentle Reader; for they fortifie that which is alreadie said, and giue a deadly blow to the Papists: two things are cleered by this testimonie of Saint *Austen*, the one, that concupiscence to which consent is not giuen, bringeth forth ill desires: the other, that the said desires are vnlawfull, and prohibited by the law of God. And so wee haue it euidently prooued, by many inuincible reasons; that concupiscence habituall, to which the regenerate yeeld no consent, but stoutly resist the same; is so farre from being meritorious, as the papist teach, that it is sinne formally, and properly so called. Neither will it serue their turne, to obiect that which is

euer in tdeir mouthes, that it is inuoluntarie, and can no way be auoided, and so no sinne at all. This obiection I grant, carrieth a maiestie with it; and it seemeth to many men, to be insoluble. But God willing, I shall make it so cleere and euident, as euerie child may behold with facilitie, the weakenesse, falshood, and absurditie thereof.

Saint *Austen* prooueth at large in sundrie places of his workes, that inuoluntarie motions of concupiscence are sinne in deede, and truely so called. In his first Booke of retractations, he hath these words; *Illud quod in parvulis dicitur originale peccatum, cum adhuc non vtantur libero arbitrio voluntatis, non absurdè vocatur etiam voluntarium; quia ex primi hominis mala voluntate contractum, factum est quodammodo hæreditarium. Non itaq; falsum est quod dixi, vsq; adeo peccatum voluntarium malum est, vt nullo modo sit peccatum si non sit voluntarium.* That which in infants is called originall sinne, which as yet they vse not free arbitrement of will, is not absurdly called voluntarie; because being contracted of the euill will of the first man, it is become in a sort hereditarie. It is not therefore false which I sayd, sinne is an euill so voluntarie, that it is no way sin, if it be not voluntary.

Aug. lib. 1. retract. cap. 13. pag. 13.

Again, in another place S. *Austen* hath these words; *Quod si quisquã dicit etiam ipsam cupiditatẽ nihil esse aliud quam voluntatẽ sed vitiosam peccatoq; seruientẽ, non resistendum est, nec de verbis, cum res constat, controuersia facienda est. Sic enim ostenditur sine voluntate nullum esse peccatum, siue in opere, siue in origine.* But if any man say, that concupiscence is nothing else, than a will that is vitious & seruing sin, there is no resistance to be made; neither must controuersie be in words, whẽ the thing is cleere & euident. For so we proue euery sin to be voluntarie, either in the act, or else in the originall.

Aug. retract. lib. 1. cap. 15. pag. 26.

Again, he hath these words; *Propterea non perturbat de parvulis quæstio, quia ex illius origine rei tenẽtur qui voluntate peccauit, quãdo libero & ad faciendum, & ad non faciendum motu animi non carebat, eiq; ab opere malo abstinẽdi sumapotestas erat.* Therfore let no man be trobled with the questiõ about infants, becausse they are guiltie by reason of his originall,

Augustin. vbi sup. pag. 17.

that

that sinned voluntarily; hauing free motion of mind both to do and not to do, as also full power to absteine frō euill.

Thus we see most euidently, that the vnuoluntary motions of concupiscence, so tearmed of the papists, are both sinfull and voluntarie: sinfull in their nature, and voluntarie in the originall. And the Papists may as well denie concupiscence to be sinne in the infants vnbaptised, as in them that are baptised, vpon this their falsly supposed ground. For it is as vnuoluntarie in the one, as it is in the other; neither can it be any more auoided in the one, than in the other. This is the gordian knot which the Papists are neuer able to loose, or vntie.

Bellarmine himselfe is enforced to confesse, that Saint *Austen* acknowledgeth all the motions of concupiscence, euen those which be inuoluntarie, to be properly sinne, and flatly condemned by the tenth commaundement. These are his expresse words; *Hæc dicta sunt ad mentem S.* Augustini, *qui precepto, non concupisces, intelligit prohiberi aliquo modo motus omnes concupiscentiæ, etiam inuoluntarios; assensum vero his motibus, prohibere docet illo alio precepto: post concupiscentias tuas non eas.* These things are spoken after S. *Austens* mind, who by this precept, (Thou shalt not lust) vnderstandeth all the motions of concupiscence, euen the inuoluntarie, to be prohibited in some sort; and that the consent to these motions, is forbidden by that other precept; Follow not thy concupiscence. Thus writeth the Iesuiticall Cardinall: by whose doctrine it is euident, that Saint *Austen* affirmeth the first motions of concupiscence: which preuent reason cannot be auoyded to bee condemned by Saint *Paul*, as sinfull and against the law of God. Which doctrine of Saint *Austen* doth so sting and confound all papists, that *Bellarmine* knoweth not in the world what he shall answere to the same. And therefore deceitfully he addeth in his exposition of Saint *Austens* words, the word (*quodammodo*, after a sort;) which word neither is in Saint *Austen*, nor yet agreeable to his meaning. For Saint *Austen* saith plainely, simply, and absolutely,

Bellarm. to. 3. col 400. vide Aug. de spiritu & liter. cap. vlt. to. 3.

Eccles. 18. v. 30.

lutely, without all ands, or ifs, or other qualifications, that such motions are forbidden by this commandement, (*non concupiſces.*) And for the conſummation of this doctrine, (which ouerthroweth the beſt part of poperie,) I will here adde to Saint *Pauls* doctrine, and the expoſition of Saint *Auſten*; the flat teſtimonie of Saint *Iohn* an other Apoſtle, who ſingeth the ſame ſong with Saint *Paul.*

1. Ioan. 3. v. 4. Saint *Iohn* in his firſt epiſtle, hath theſe words; πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, καὶ τὴν ἀνομίαν ποιεῖ. καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία. Euery one that ſinneth, tranſgreſſeth the law. And ſinne is the tranſgreſſion of the law. Theſe are S. *Iohns* words truly tranſlated out of the originall Greeke. But before we proceed any further in the diſcourſe hereof, let vs take a view of that doctrine, which our papiſts of Rhemes haue ſent vs. Theſe are their words; Iniquitie is not taken here for wickedneſſe, as it is commonly vſed both in Latin & in our language, as is plaine by the Greeke word ἀνομία, ſignifying nothing elſe, but ſwaruing or declining from the ſtraight line of the law of God, or nature. So that the Apoſtle meaneth, that euery ſinne is an obliquitie or defect from the rule of the law: but not contrarie, that euery ſuch ſwaruing from the law, ſhould be properly a ſinne, as the heretikes doe vntruly gather, to proue that concupiſcence remaining after baptiſme is a very ſinne, though we neuer giue our conſent vnto it. Thus they write. Out of whoſe words, I gather two notable documents; the one, that the word ἀνομία is a defect and ſwaruing from the law, but not properly a ſinne: the other, that if ἀνομία be proued to be ſinne properly, then will it alſo follow of neceſſity by S. *Iohns* doctrine, that concupiſcence in the regenerate is properly ſinne. Let this doctrine be well marked, as which is no leſſe apparant then important. Now, it only remaineth for the victorie, and truth of this article, That I proue againſt our papiſts the Rhemiſts, that the Greeke word ἀνομία doth ſignifie ſinne properly: behold the proofe.

Rhemes teſt. in the notes in 1. Ioan. 3. 4.

Arias Mont. in 1. Ioan. 3. A very famous Papiſt and great linguiſt, *Ben. Arias Montanus*, ſaith plainely in expreſſe tearmes, that ἀνομία is

is *transgressio legis*, the transgression of the law. Now, that the transgression of Gods law is properly sinne, none is so sottish, that he doth not vnderstand it; none so impious, that he will denie it; none so peeuish, that he will not acknowledge it. But I proue the same.

S. *Ambrose* hath these words: *Quid est enim peccatum, nisi preuaricatio legis diuinæ, & cœlestium inobedientia præceptorum?* For what is sinne, but the transgression of Gods law, and disobedience to his heauenly precepts? Loe, sinne (saith S. *Ambrose*) is nothing els but the transgression of Gods law, that is to say, nothing els but ἀνομία, as S. *Iohn* teacheth it, and as *Arias Montanus* doth interpret it.

Ambros. de parad. ca. 8. to. 4. Vide Ambros. in 7. ca ad rom. & in fine huius articuli.

S. *Austen* hath these words: *Peccatum est transgressio legis.* Sinne is a transgression of the law. Loe, S. *Austen* concludeth with *S. Ambrose*, and they both agree with *S. Iohn.*

August. de consens. Euangel. cap. 4. tom. 4.

The same *S. Austen* in another place defineth sinne in this manner. *Peccatum est dictum, vel factum, vel concupitum aliquid, contra legem æternam.* Sinne is a word, deed, thought, or desire, against the eternall law (of God.) And what the eternall law is, he sheweth in these words next following in the same place: *Lex æterna est ratio diuina vel voluntas Dei, ordinem naturalem conseruari iubens, perturbari vetans.* The eternall law is the reason or will of God, which commaundeth the naturall order to be obserued, and forbiddeth the same to be perturbed.

Aug. cõt. Faust. lib. 22. ca. 27. to. 6. pa. 281.

Vide Bernard. de aduent. do. serm. 6. to. 1. p. 16.

Thus writeth this auntient, graue, and learned father; by whose iudgement it is properly sinne, whatsoeuer is against the will of God. So then, Gods will is that law and rule, by which euery sinne must be measured and tried. And consequently, whatsoeuer declineth, declineth, or swarueth from the will of God, the same is most properlie sinne. The reason hereof is euident, because not to be correspondent and agreeable to Gods will, is the very intrinsecall reason, essence, and nature of sinne. But so it is, that the ἀταξία, disorder, and concupiscence in the regenerate, is repugnant and disagreeable to the will of God: and consequently, it must be sinne indeed.

Beda in 1. Ioan. 3.

S. Bede, who for his learning and vertue was renowned throughout the whole Christian world, and thereupon surnamed *venerabilis*, hath these expresse words: *Virtus huius sententiæ facilius in lingua Græcorum, qua edita est epistola, comprehenditur. Si quidem apud eos iniquitas ἀνομία vocatur, quod significat quasi contra legem vel sine lege factum. Si quidem lex Græce νόμος appellatur sequitur; sed & latinum nomen eidem rationi congruit, quod iniquitas quasi æquitati aduersa nuncupatur. Quia quicunque peccat, contrarius nimirum æquitati diuinæ legis peccando existit.* The force and efficacie of this sentence is more easily perceiued in the Greeke toong, in which the epistle was written. For iniquitie with them is called ἀνομία, which signifieth, As done against law, or without law. For the law is called in Greeke νόμος. The Latine word also agreeth to the same reason, because it is called iniquitie, as being against equitie: for euery one that sinneth, is by reason of sinne, cõtrarie to the equitie of Gods law. See more to this effect in the eight article following.

Dionys. Carthus. in 1. Ioan. 3.

Dionysius Carthusianus, a famous papist, hath these words: *Lex autem diuina est æquitas ipsa; sicq; mortale peccatum est iniquitas, id est, non æquitas, vtpote violatio æquitatis.* The law of God is equitie it selfe: and consequently, iniquitie, that is, not equitie, to wit, the transgression of equitie, is a mortall sinne.

Lyr. in 1. Ioan. 3.

Nicolaus de Lyra, another famous popish writer, hath these words: *Peccatum est transgressio legis diuinæ. Lex autem diuina est ipsas æquitas; & ideo in omni peccato mortali est equitatis corruptio, & per consequens, iniquitas.* Sinne is the transgression of the law diuine, and therefore in euery mortall sinne there is corruption of equitie: and consequently, there is also iniquitie.

The Corollarie.

Now gentle reader, thou hast heard the expresse words and plaine testimonies, as well of the auntient Fathers, S. *Ambrose*, S. *Austen*, and S. *Bede*, as also of the two famous popish writers, *Carthusianus*, and *Lyranus*, concerning this great question & most important point of doctrine, in which

which the verie life of poperie doth consist.

I haue prooued first euen by the testimonie of S. *Paule*, and of S. *Austen*. expounding his words, as also of the Iesuit *Bellarmine* graunting the same, that concupiscence remaining after baptisme in the regenerate, is both called sinne, and is properly sinne indeed.

Secondly, that the first motions of concupiscence which are connaturall to the corrupt man, and can no way be auoided, are flatly forbidden by this Commaundement, *Thou shalt not couet.*

Thirdly, that though the sayd rebellious motions be inuoluntarie in the worke; yet are they voluntarie in the originall: which is sufficient saith S. *Austen.*

Fourthly, that Cardinall *Bellarmine* not able truly to answere S. *Austens* words, hath in his explication added deceitfully, this word (*quodammodo*) after a sort: Which word cannot be found in S. *Austen*, neither is it agreeable to his meaning. But such beggerly shifts and silly euasions are the props and staues of late Romish religion.

Fiftly, that by S. *Iohns* doctrine, euery deflection from the eternall law, is properly ἀνομία, and consequently, it is properly sinne.

Sixtly, that S. *Ambrose*, S. *Austen*, and S. *Bede*, doe all three affirme constantly and with vniforme assent, that sinne is nothing else but ἀνομία, and a transgression of the lawe of God.

Seuenthly, that by the flat doctrine not onely of Saint *Bede*, but also of two famous popish writers (whose authoritie is euer most forcible against papists) *Dyonisius Carthusianus*, and *Nicholaus Lyranus*, iniquitie is a mortal sinne, because it is against the eternal law, which is equity it selfe, and the will of God.

Eightly, that our papists of Rhemes, doe confute themselues vnawares, while they tell vs, that euerie sinne is a declyning and swaruing from Gods law: but withall denie, that euerie such swaruing from Gods law, is properly sinne. For, seeing Gods law is nothing els but his will, as is alrea-

die

die proued, the Papists must either confesse, that to swarue and decline from Gods will is prōperly sinne; or else, that to decline and swarue from Gods will, is consonant and agreeable to his will: which to hold, is not onely most absurd, but withall implyeth flat contradiction.

Against this discourse of originall concupiscence in the regenerate, nothing in truth can bee alledged for the papists. Yet, to take away all wrangling, I will truely put downe the vpshot of our Rhemists, and frame my answer to the same. Thus doe they write, Though in the 5. Chapter, verse 17. the Apostle turne the speech, affirming euerie iniquitie to be sinne; yet there the Greeke word is not the same as before, ἀνομία, but ἀδικία. By which it is plain, that there he meaneth by iniquitie, mans actuall and proper transgression, which must needs be a sinne. These are their words, to which I answere in this wise.

Rhemists in 1. Iohn 3.

First, that though the Greeke word bee different, yet is it equiualent, and so the sence all one. This to be so, *S. Austen* will testifie me in these words: *Nemo dicat, aliud est peccatum, at q; aliud iniquitas. Nemo dicat, ego peccator homo sum. sed iniquus non sum. Omnis qui facit peccatum, & iniquitatem facit.* Let no man say, sinne is one thing, and iniquitie another thing. Let no man say, I am a sinfull man, but not vnrighteous. For euerie one that committeth sinne, committeth also iniquitie. Thus writeth *S. Austen*, and what he saith, the same say *Beda* and *Oecumenius*. Who as we see here, doth plainely and expresly affirme, sin and iniquitie to be all one. So that whatsoeuer is sinne, must also be iniquitie: and whatsoeuer is iniquitie, the same likewise must be sin. Neither is it to the purpose to iterate their vsual song, because, as is already proued, *S. Ambrose* telleth them in another place, that this sin is committed against the will of man. These are his words: *Numquid quia inuitum hominem dicit peccare, immunis debet videri à crimine: quia hoc agit quod non vult, pressus vi potestatis? Non vtique. Ipsius enim vitio & desidia hæc cœpta sunt. Quia enim mancipauit se per assensum peccato, iure illius dominatur.* Is therefore a man

Aug. in epist. Ioan. tract. 4. tom. 9. pa. 412

Ambros. in 7. cap. ad Roman. p. 205.

cleere

cleere and free from ſinne, becauſe hee ſaith man ſinneth againſt his will? becauſe he doth that which he would not doe, being preſſed with the violence of power? No truely: for theſe thinges began through his fault and negligence. For ſeeing he conſented to be a ſlaue vnto ſinne, ſinne by right hath Dominion ouer him. Loe, a man is guiltie of ſinne, yea euen of that ſinne which he doth againſt his will, and cannot auoide the ſame, that is of originall concupiſcence. And S. *Ambroſe* yeeldeth a reaſon hereof, becauſe this impoſſibilitie came of mans default. And this is the verie caſe of infants, as is alreadie ſaid. Let the Reader here obſerue ſeriouſly with me, that S. *Ambroſe* calleth this inuoluntarie concupiſcence, *crimen*, a crime of mortall ſinne.

Inuoluntarie in the act, yet voluntarie in the cauſe.

Secondly, that S. *Bede* affirmeth not only all to be ſinne which is iniquitie; but alſo reputeth the verie corruption of innocencie, which commeth of infirmitie, to bee ſinne in Gods ſight. Theſe are his expreſſe words: *Omnes qui peccant præuaricationis rei ſunt; hoc eſt, non ſolum illi qui data ſibi ſcriptæ legis ſcita contemnunt, ſed & illi qui innocentiam legis naturalis quam in protoplaſto omnes accepimus, ſiue infirmitate, ſiue negligentia, ſiue etiam ignorantia corrumpunt.* All that ſinne are guiltie of preuarication or tranſgreſſion of the lawe; that is, not onely they which contemne the precepts of the written law giuen them, but they alſo, which either of infirmitie, or of negligence, or of ignorance, corrupt the innocencie of the law of Nature, which we all receiue in the Protoplaſt (*Adam.*)

Beda vbi ſupr.

S. *Ambroſe* in another place iumpeth with *Bede* in theſe words: *Non diſcreuit concupiſcentiam hanc à peccato, ſed miſcuit, hoc ſignificans, quia cum nec ſuſpicio quidem eſſet iſtud non licere apud deum, cognoui inquit, eſſe peccatum. Sub ſua perſona, quaſi generalem egit cauſam. Lexitaq; concupiſcentiæ prohibet, quæ propterea quod oblectamẽto eſt, non putabatur eſſe peccatum.* He hath not diſcerned this concupiſcence from ſin, but hath coupled it with ſin, ſignifying thereby, that when there was not ſo much as any ſuſpition, that this thing was not lawful before God, I knew, ſaith he, that it is ſin. Vnder

Ambroſ. in 7. c. ad Ro. p. 103

his own person, he pleadeth as it were the generall cause. The lawe therefore forbiddeth coucupiscence, which because it delighteth, seemeth not to be sinne. Thus writeth S. *Ambrose*; whose words cannot possibly be vnderstood of any other concupiscence, than of that which is inuoluntarie and originall.

Thirdly, that their owne vulgar Latine text, (which the late councell of Trent preferred before both the Hebrew and the Greeke, and commaundeth all papists to vse it as authenticall, and none other) hath the word (*iniquitas*) in both places; and doth call as well ἀδικια as ἀνομια, Iniquitie: these are the expresse words; *omnis iniquitas peccatum est*: All iniquitie is sinne. Loe, their owne translation (to which all Papists are tyed as a Beare to a stake) doth flatly confound them all, and sayth plainely and expressely, That euerie iniquitie is a sinne. And yet the Papists of Rhemes bluntishly and impudently defend the contrarie, crying out with open mouthes, That some iniquitie is not sinne. The truth is this, that they are driuen to a *non plus*, and cannot tell in the world what to say against this doctrine of concupiscence in the regenerate. For both ἀνομια and ἀδικια is truly & fitly termed *iniquitas* or iniquitie. Which (but that I studie to be briefe) I could shew by a thousand testimonies, out of S. *Austen*. S. *Ambrose*, and S. *Bede*. Answere therefore ô papist if ye can, or if ye dare not, because ye cannot, then reclaime your selues, and yeeld vnto the truth for shame. I challenge you, and adiure you, if your hearts fayle you not, and if your owne consciences condemne you not, to send me an answere to this short challenge, which I haue compiled verie briefely so once to prouoke you to the open combat, which I haue now many yeares expected at your hands, and could neuer yet finde so much courage in any of you all. Wherefore to seale vp the veritie of this article, as an vndoubted truth, I will here adde for the complement, as a most delicat post-past, to satisfie the longing appetites of the Iesuit *Parsons*, the Archpriest *Blackwell*, and all the traiterous crew of that

1. Ioan. 3. v. 17

Iesuited

Iesuited brotherhood; the flat testimonie of their saint *Thomas Aquinas*, whose doctrine they are bound to defend, beleeue, and approoue, and may not in any case refuse or denie the same: these are his expresse words; *Dicendum quod illud quod homo facit sine deliberatione rationis non perfectè ipse facit; quia nihil operatur ibi id quod est principale in homine. Vnde nō est perfectè actus humanus, & per consequens nō potest esse perfectè actus virtutis vel peccati, sed aliquid imperfectum in genere horū. Vnde talis motus sensualitatis rationem præueniens, est peccatum veniale, quod est quiddā imperfectum in genere peccati.* We must answere, that that which mā doth without the deliberatiō of reason, he doth it not perfectly, because that which is the chiefest in man, worketh nothing there: wherefore it is not perfectly mans act, and cōsequētly it cannot be perfectly the act of vertue or of sinne, but some vnperfect thing in this kind. Whereupon it commeth, that such a motion of sensualitie preuēting reason, is a venial sin, which is a certaine imperfect thing in the nature of sinne. *Aquinas.* 1.2. q. 74. art. 3.

Thus writeth *Aquinas*, out of whose words I note these important obseruations. First, that this *Aquinas* is a popish canonized saint. Secondly, that for his great learning he was surnamed, *Doctor Angelicus*, The Angelicall Doctor. Thirdly, that Pope *Urbanus* the fourth, and Pope *Innocentius* the fift, did so admire and reuerence the excellent learning of this famous schoole-doctor (who was a learned clarke indeed) that they confirmed his doctrine for authenticall, and gaue it the first place after the canonicall Scripture. Fourthly, that this great doctor, so highly renowned in the Romish church, that no papist may denie or gainesay that which he hath written, graunteth freely, teacheth plainely, and auoucheth constantly, that the inordinate motion of sensualitie which goeth before reason is properly a sinne, though but a veniall sinne, as he tearmeth it. For it is one thing, to be a sinne perfectly, another thing, to be a sinne properly. A veniall and little sinne is as well, and as truly a sinne, as a mortall and great sinne, as the papists tearme them. For he is as truly and properly a

theefe that ſtealeth a lambe or a gooſe, as he that ſtealeth an oxe or a horſe, though not a theefe in ſo high degree. For mortall and veniall ſinnes (as the papiſts tearme them) doe onely differ, *Secundum magis & minus*, according to more and leſſe. But in truth, euery ſinne is mortall, as I haue alreadie proued in my booke of Motiues. Anſwere ô Papiſts, if ye can; if not, repent for ſhame.

Add to this the fixt article, and note it well.

The fift Article. Of the condigne ſo ſuppoſed merite of workes.

THe papiſts either of ignorance or of malice, do moſt vnchriſtianlie ſlander the profeſſors of Chriſts Goſpell, as though they were enemies to good workes: when in deed, they both thinke, preach, and write, more Chriſtianly, more religiouſly, and more ſincerely, than the papiſts doe, of and concerning godlie actions and good workes. In regard hereof, before I come to the maine point of that, which I purpoſe to oppugne in this article: I graunt firſt of all, that though good workes neither doe nor can goe before iuſtification; yet they euer follow (as the fruites follow the tree) the perſons that are freely iuſtified by Gods mercie in Chriſt Ieſus, for his merits and condigne deſerts.

I graunt ſecondly, that though good workes goe not before iuſtification; yet doe they ſo neceſſarilie goe before ſaluation, that no man without them can attaine eternall life, when poſſibilitie is graunted to do them.

I graunt thirdly, that good workes are the true effects of predestination; by which the children of God make their saluation sure vnto themselues, and manifest vnto the world. Yet this notwithstanding, I hold constantlie, beleeue stedfastly, and affirme Christianlie, that albeit good workes are the effects of predestination, and necessarie fruits of faith and iustification; yet neither are they the cause of predestination, nor of iustification, neither doe they or can they merit *ex condigno*, eternall life or glorie. I say (merit *ex condigno*) because I willingly graunt with the auntient writers and holie fathers, that good workes in a godly sense may be said to merit; that is to say, to impetrate fauour and reward at Gods hands, for his mercie and promise sake, who hath promised not to leaue vnrewarded, so much as one cup of cold water giuen in his name: but they can neuer truly be said to merite, for any worthinesse or condigne desert of the works that are done. Against which last part, I contend with the papists at this present; and namely, against the late decree of the late Romish Counsell of Trent, whose expresse words are these; *Si quis dixerit hominis iustificati bona opera ita esse dona Dei, vt non sint etiam bona ipsius iustificati merita, aut ipsum iustificatum, bonis operibus quæ ab eo per Dei gratiam & Iesu Christi meritum, cuius membrum viuum est, fiunt, non verè mereri augmentum gratiæ, vitam æternam, & ipsius vitæ æternæ, si tamen in gratia decesserit, consecutionem, atq; etiam gloriæ augmentum, anathema sit.* If any shall say, that the good workes of the iustified man are so the gifts of God, that they be not also the good merites of him that is iustified; or that the iustified man, by his good workes which he doth by the grace of God, and merit of Christ Iesus, whose liuely member he is, doth not truly merit the increase of grace, eternall life, and the consequution of the same eternall life, if he shall depart hence in grace, and also the augment of glory, let him be accursed.

Matt. 10. *v.* 42. *Iac.* 1. 12.

Concil. Trid. sess. 6. *die* 13. *Iun. can.* 32.

Heere we see the flat doctrine of the Romish Church,

which whosoeuer will not beleeue stedfastly, must bee damned euerlastingly, and with fire and faggot bee sent packing speedily. Yet that this doctrine is most absurd in it selfe, most blasphemous against the free mercie of God, and most iniurious to the inestimable merits of our Lord Iesus; I vndertake by Gods assistance, to prooue by such cleere and euident demonstrations, as shall be able to satisfie all indifferent readers, and to put the papists to silence for euer in this behalfe.

The first reason, drawne from holy Scriptures.

Rom.6.v.23. THe first place of holy scripture, is conteined in these words; τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. But the gift of God is life euerlasting in Christ Iesus our Lord. This text of scripture doth plainely conuince that life eternall cannot be condignely atchieued, by the works of man; for being the free gift of God, it can no way be due to the merite of mans worke. The Rhemists to extenuate the cleerenesse of this text, and as it were to hide and conceale the euidencie thereof, do translate, for the Gift of God, the Grace of God, following their old vulgar Latin edition. Which translation though in this place it may be admitted, yet doth it not sufficiently expresse the efficacie of the originall word χάρισμα, which signifieth a gift freely bestowed; for which respect, their owne famous linguist *Arias Montanus*, who was the onely man chosen as most sufficient, for the translation of the old testament out of the Hebrew, and of the new out of Greeke, and imployed by the king of Spaine for that onlie end, did not translate *gratia*, but *donatio*; not grace, but donation (or free gift.) Now, let vs see and view the iudgement of the holy fathers, vpon this portion of holy writ. S. *Theodoret* hath these words; *Hic non dicit mercedem, sed gratiam: est enim Dei donũ vita æterna, & si quis enim summã & absolutã iustitiam præstiterit, temporalibus laboribus æterna in æquilibrio non respondent.* He saith not here reward, but grace; for eternall life is the gift of God: For although one-

Theod in ca.6. ad Roman.

one could performe the higheſt and abſolute iuſtice, yet eternally ioyes being weighed with temporall labours, are nothing anſwerable.

Saint *Chryſoſtome* hath theſe words; *Non eundem ſeruat oppoſitorum ordinem. Non enim dicit, merces benefactorum veſtrorum vita æterna, ſed donum Dei vita æterna; vt oſtenderet, quòd non propriis viribus liberati ſint, neq; debitum, aut merces, aut laborum ſit retributio, ſed omnia illa ex diuino munere gratuitò acceperint.* He doth not obſerue the ſame order of oppoſites. For hee ſaith not, eternall life is the reward of your good workes; but, eternall life is the gift of God: that he might ſhew, that they are not deliuered by their owne ſtrength or vertues; and that it is not a debt, or a wages, or a retribution of labours, but that they haue receiued all thoſe things freely of the gift of God. *Chryſoſt. in ca. 6. ad Rom.*

Origen writeth thus, vpon the ſame words; *Deum verò non erat dignum militibus ſuis ſtipendia, quaſi debitum aliq; dare; ſed donum & gratiam quæ eſt vita æterna, in Chriſto Ieſu domino noſtro.* But it was not a thing worthy beſeeming God, to giue ſtipends to his ſouldiours, as a due debt or wage: but to beſtow on them a gift or free grace, which is eternall life in Chriſt Ieſus our Lord. *Origen in ca. 6. ad Rom.*

Saint *Ambroſe* hath theſe words: *Sicut enim ſequentes peccatum acquirunt mortem, ita & ſequentes gratiam Dei, id eſt, fidem Chriſti quæ donat peccata, habebunt vitam æternam.* For as they that follow ſinne, gaine death: ſo they that follow the grace of Chriſt, that is, the faith of Chriſt which forgiueth ſinnes, ſhall haue eternall life. *Ambroſ. in ca. 6. ad Rom.*

Theophilact. hath theſe words: *Gratiam autem, non mercedem dixit à Deo futurum, perinde ac ſi inquiat: non enim laborum accipitis præmia, ſed per gratiam fiunt hæc omnia in Chriſto Ieſu, qui hæc operatur & facilitat.* He ſaid grace, not wages, was to come from God: as if he ſhould ſay for yee receiue not rewardes of labours, but all theſe thinges are done by grace in Chriſts Ieſus, who worketh & doth them. *Theopl. in cap. 6. Rom.*

Anſelmus and *Photius* haue the ſame wordes in effect, which I omit in regard of breuitie.

By

By theſe manifold teſtimonies of the holy fathers, the doctrine which I defend, is cleere and euident; *viz.* that eternall life is the free guift of God, and is not merited or purchaſed by deſert of man; that eternall life is not a due debt, a deſerued wages, or retribution of mans labours, but proceedeth wholy and ſolie of the free mercie and grace of God; that mans workes waighed in the ballance, with the ioyes of heauen, are nothing at all anſwerable vnto them. To which Fathers, I will adde the verdict of *Paulus Burgenſis*, a verie famous popiſh Spaniſh Biſhop.

Paulus Burg. addit. 2. in 6. cap. ad Rom. Theſe are his words: *Noluit ergo dicere, ſtipendium iuſtitiæ vita æterna: ſed maluit dicere, gratia Dei vita æterna: quia eadem merita quibus redditur, non a nobis ſunt, ſed in nobis à Deo facta ſunt per gratiam.* He would not therfore ſay, eternall life is the ſtipend of iuſtice: but he had rather ſay, eternall life is the grace of God: becauſe the ſame merits to which it is rendered, are not of our ſelues, but wrought in our ſelues by God through grace.

The ſecond text of holy ſcripture, is contained in theſe *Rom. 8. v. 18.* wordes: I count that the afflictions of this preſent time, are not worthy of the future glorie, which ſhall bee reuealed toward vs. Loe, all our παθήματα, all our paſſions, afflictions, and penalties, that we are able to endure in this life, are ſo farre from being meritorious of eternall life, that they are in no wiſe comparable to the ſame.

Theodoretus doth liuely expreſſe this veritie, in theſe *Theodor. in ca. 8. ad Rom.* moſt golden words: *Superant certamina coronæ, non comparantur cum laboribus remunerationes, labor enim paruus eſt, ſed magnum lucrum ſperatur. Et propterea non mercedem, ſed gloriam vocauit ea quæ expectantur.* The conflicts of the crown doe remaine, the labours are not comparable to the rewards: for the labour is ſmall, but the gaine hoped for, is great. And therefore the things expected, are not called a reward, but glorie.

Anſelmus in 8. cap. ad Rom. *Anſelmus* hath theſe words; *Hoc eſt ſi quis puteretur omnes pœnarum acerbitates, quæ in tempore preſentis vitæ ſufferri poſſunt; non eſſent omnes illæ paſſiones dignum meritum ad conſequutionem*

ſequutionem futuræ gloriæ, quæ ablato omni velamine reuelabitur in nobis. If one ſhould ſuffer all kinds of torment, which can be endured in this life: yet would not all thoſe afflictions, or torments, or paſſions, be a ſufficient and condigne merite, to attaine the future glorie; which, when euery vaile is taken out of the way, ſhall be reuealed in vs. Marke well theſe wordes in this famous popiſh writer, becauſe they are moſt important: for, ſeeing hee was a great papiſt, his proofe muſt needes bee good againſt the Papiſts. Againe, his words are ſo cleere and manifeſt, that no euaſion can haue place. For, hee ſaith in plaine and expreſſe tearmes; that all which is poſſible to bee done or endured in this world, can not bee a worthy or condigne merite of eternall life. No anſwere in truth, can be made hereunto, it iumpeth in deed; with the true ſence and meaning of Saint *Paul.*

The third place of holy *S*cripture, is contayned in theſe wordes: Not by the works of iuſtice which we haue done, but according to his mercie hee hath ſaued vs, by the Lauer of regeneration and renouation of the holy Ghoſt. Theſe are the Apoſtles wordes, euen as our Rhemiſts haue alledged them. By which wordes it is moſt cleere and apparant, that we are not onely iuſtified. but alſo ſaued of meere mercie and the free gift of God. And conſequenrly, that eternall life hath no merite on the behalfe of man. For after ſaluation once accompliſhed, all merite is vaine and needleſſe. *Tit.3.5.*

Anſelmus hath theſe golden words; *Tunc ſaluos nos fecit, qui noſtris meritis eramus perditione digni: non enim ex operibus iuſtitiæ quæ fecimus nos, proceſſit hæc ſalus, quia nulla opera iuſtitiæ feceramus, vnde ſalutem meruiſſemus; ſed ipſe ſecundum miſericordiam ſuam ſaluos nos fecit, non ſecundum merita noſtra nobis hanc ſalutem dedit.* Then did hee ſaue vs, who by our own merits deſerued perditiō. For, this ſaluation came not from the works of iuſtice, which we haue don, becauſe we had don the works of iuſtice, by which we ſhuld merit ſaluation: but hee according to his mercie ſaued vs, *Anſelmus in tit. cap. 3.*

and not according to our merits gaue he vs this saluation.

Dionys. in ti. 3 The famous papist *Dionysius Carthusianus*, expoundeth Saint *Paul* euen as *Anselmus* did. These are his wordes: *Non ex operibus iustitiæ quæ fecimus nos: id est, non propter merita nostra quæ nulla fuerunt, quia prædictis peccatis eramus obnoxij sed secundum suam misericordiam saluos nos fecit, à potestate diaboli & reatu æterni tormenti, merito suæ conuersationis & passionis.* Not of the works of righteousnesse which we haue done; that is, not for our merits which were none at all, because we were subiect to the afore named sinnes: but according to his mercy hath he saued vs, from the power of the diuell and guilt of eternall torment, by the merit of his holy conuersation and passion. Loe, our saluation commeth not of mans merits, but of the merits of the son of God. This shall suffice for the first reason, which is drawne from the authoritie of holy writ.

The second reason, drawne from the authoritie of the holy Fathers.

SAint *Austen* hath many excellent testimonies in his workes, which doe euidently approue and confirme this my doctrine, against the popish supposed condigne merit of workes; but I will content my selfe, with one or

Aug. ad Hier. epist. 29. two at this present. Thus doth he write; *Virtus est charitas, quâ id quod diligendum est diligitur: hæc in aliis maior, in aliis minor, in aliis nulla est; plenissima vero, quæ iam non possit augeri, quandiu hic homo viuit, est in nemine: quandiu autem augeri potest, profectò illud quod minus est quam debit, ex vitio est. Ex quo vitio non est iustus in terra qui faciat bonum, & non peccet. Ex quo vitio, non iustificabitur in conspectu Dei omnis viuens. Propter quod vitium si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus, nosmet ipsos seducimus, & veritas in nobis non est. Propter quod etiam quantum libet profecerimus, necessarium est nobis dicere; dimitte nobis debita nostra, cum iam omnia in baptismo dicta, facta, cogitata, dimissa sint.* Charitie is a vertue, with which we loue that that ought to bee loued. This in some is more, in others lesse, in others none

at

at all; but the perfect charitie, which cannot be increased while a man here liueth, is found in none: so long as it can be increased, that doubtlesse which is lesse then it should be, proceedeth of sinne; by reason of which sinne, there is not one iust vpon earth, that doth good and sinneth not: by reason of which vice, if we say we haue no sinne, we deceiue our selues, and the truth is not in vs: by reason of which sinne, how much soeuer we profit, yet must we say of necessitie. Forgiue vs our trespasses, euen after that all our thoughts, words, and workes, are forgiuen in baptisme. Thus writeth Saint *Austen*, that mightie piller of Christs Church: out of whose most golden wordes, I note sundrie excellent documents to the great comfort of the faithfull, and to the euerlasting confusion of all impenitent papists. For first Saint *Austen* saith, that no man can haue charitie in that perfect degree, which the law requireth. Secondly, that the want thereof, proceedeth of that vice that is inherent in vs. Thirdly, that by reason of this vice, euery man is a sinner. Fourthly, that by reason thereof, none liuing can be iustified in Gods sight. Fiftly, that by reason thereof, whosoeuer saith he hath no sinne, is a flat lier. Sixtly, that how vertuously soeuer we liue, yet must we desire God to forgiue vs our sinnes, by reason of this inherent vice. Seauenthly, that we must thus pray, euen after all sinnes be forgiuen vs in our baptisme.

Againe, the same Saint *Austen* in an other place hath these words; *Iustitia modo nostra ex fide, iustitia perfecta non est nisi in angelis, & vix in angelis si Deo comparentur; tamen si qua perfecta iustitia animarum & spirituum est, quos Deus creauit, in angelis sanctis, iustis, bonis, nullo lapsu auersis, nulla superbia cadentibus, sed manentibus semper in contemplatione verbi Dei, & nihil aliud dulce habentibus, nisi à quo creati sunt, in ipsis perfecta iustitia est, in nobis autem ex fide cœpit esse secundum spiritum.* Our iustice is now of faith, there is no perfect iustice but in the Angels, and scarce in the Angels, if they be compared to God. Yet if there *August. in epist. Ioan. tra. 4. tom. 9.*

be any perfect iustice of soules and spirits which God hath created in the holy Angels, iust, good, by no lapse auerted, by no pride falling, but euer abiding in the contemplation of the word of God, and thinking nothing sweet, but him onely which created them: in them iustice is perfect, but in vs (it is not perfect) it is onely begun of faith according to the spirit. Thus saith Saint *Austen*, telling vs very plainely, that there is no perfect iustice in man: but doubtlesse, where no perfect iustice is, there can be no condigne merite of eternall life.

Ambros. lib. 10 epist. 84. to. 3. S. *Ambrose* is consonant to *S. Austen*, who writeth in this manner: *Caro contra spiritum, & contra carnem spiritus concupiscit; nec inuenitur in vllo hominum tanta concordia, vt legimentis lex quæ membris est insita, non repugnet. Propter quod ex omnium sanctorum persona accipitur, quod Ioannes Apostolus ait; si dixerimus quoniam peccatum non habemus, nos ipsos seducimus, & veritas in nobis non est.* The flesh (saith *S. Ambrose*) coueteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh: neither can there be found in any man such concord or agreement, that the law which is ingrafted in the members, fighteth not against the law of the mind. And for that cause Saint *Iohns* words are taken as spoken in the person of all Saints; If we say we haue no sinne, we deceiue our selues, and there is no truth in vs.

Thus writeth S. *Ambrose*; out of whose words I note first, that concupiscence mooueth rebellion against the spirit, in the holiest man vpon earth. Secondly, that this rebellion is sinne in euery one: for *S. Iohn* speaketh of sinne indeed. Thirdly, that no man liuing is free from sinne; and consequently, that none liuing in this pilgrimage of mortalitie, can condignely merite eternall life.

Chrysost. de compunct. cord. lib. 2. tom. 5. col. 592. *S. Chrysostome* is consonant to *S. Ambrose* and *S. Austen*: these are his words; *Etsi millies moriamur, etsi omnes virtutes animi expleamus, nihil dignum gerimus ad ea, quæ ipsi percepimus à deo.* Though we die a thousand times, and though we accomplish all vertues of the mind; yet do we nothing worthie of those things which we receiue of God.

Theophilact

Theophilact saith in this manner: *Seruauit nos æternum, non ex operibus quæ fecimus, hoc est, neq; fecimus opera iustitiæ, neq; per hæc conseruati sumus, sed vniuersam salutem bonitas ipsius atq; clementia operata est.* He hath saued vs eternally, not of the works which we haue done, that is, neither haue we done the workes of iustice, neither are we saued by them, but his goodnesse and his clemencie hath wrought our saluation wholly. *Theophil. in 3. cap. Tit.*

Now, to knit vp this reason with all consents in one, I will here set downe the flat and plaine report of a famous Frier and popish bishop, in that booke which he dedicated to Pope *Sixtus* the fift: *Post humillimam sanctorum pedum deosculationem.* These are the words: *Eodem etiam modo considerantes omnes alij doctores sancti naturalem solummodo bonorum operum valorem, & illum à valore & iusta vitæ æternæ æstimatione longissimè distare perpendentes, prudenter dixerunt, opera nostra non esse meritoria aut digna vitæ æternæ. Ex lege tamen, siue conuentione, siue promissione facta nobiscum, opera bona hominis cum adiutorio gratiæ dei fiunt æternæ vitæ digna, & illi æqualia; quæ secluſa illa dei promissione, quæ passim in sacris literis reperitur, fuissent tanto premio prorsus indigna.* All other holy doctors also, considering after the same manner the naturall value only of good works, and perceiuing that it is exceeding farre distant from the value and iust estimation of eternall life, said wisely, That our works are not meritorious nor worthie of eternall life. Yet for the couenant and promise made vnto vs, the good works of man with the help of Gods grace, are worthie of eternall life, and equall with it; which for all that, that promise of God which is frequent in the Scripture, set aside, were altogether vnworthie of so great reward. *Ioseph. Angler in 2. lib. ſ. pag. 103.*

Lo, this Frier granteth, that all the holy Fathers are against the papists,

Thus saith our popish bishop, our holy Frier, euen to the Pope himselfe, after the humble kissing of his most holy feet. Who though he bestirre himselfe more than a little, to establish the condigne merite of mans workes, yet doth he in his owne kind of dispute and reasoning, vterly confute and confound himselfe. For first, he graun-

teth, that not onely S. *Chrysostome*, but all the rest of the holy fathers with him (marke well, gentle reader) affirme constantly and vniformely with one voyce and assent (a testimonie almost incredible to proceed from the mouth of a papist, so deere to the Pope) That good workes neither are meritorious, nor worthie of eternall life. Secondly, he graunteth freely, that the best workes considered in their owne nature and kind, are vnworthy of eternall life. Thirdly, hee graunteth willingly, and telleth the Pope roundly (*post deosculationem pedum*, but after the kissing of his feet) that good workes, euen as they proceed of grace and assistance of the holy ghost, are for all that altogether vnworthie of eternall life, if Gods promise and free acceptation be set apart. Which three points doubtlesse, are all that we desire to be graunted, concerning the doctrine of good workes. And consequently, though the papists neuer cease to impeach, accuse, slaunder, and condemne vs in this behalfe: yet do we defend nothing herein (as is euident to the indifferēt reader) but euen that which their owne best doctors in their printed bookes doe teach vs; yea, in those very bookes which are dedicate to the Pope himselfe, and that with the solemne and religious deosculation of his holy feet. The conceits which bishop Frier *Ioseph* alledgeth, to make good his imagined condigne merit of workes, are very childish and too too friuolous. For first, where he saith, that the fathers speake of good workes, onely in respect of their naturall value, as he tearmeth it; I answere, that that silly glosse is onely inuented by him and his fellowes, to saue the life of their beggerly doctrine, if it would be. For no such thing can be found in any one of all their bookes. Nay, our Frier bishop confuteth himselfe vnawares (of such force is the truth) when he graunteth, that good workes done in grace, are vtterly vnworthie of heauen, if Gods promise be set apart. Where I wish the reader to obserue seriously the word (*prorsus*, vtterly) which is indeed his owne, and most emphaticall against himselfe.

The papists grant as much as we desire.

Their

Their highly renowned Abbot and canonized Saint *Bernardus* shall tell them the truth, and giue the vpshot of the game: these are his expresse words: *Iam vero de æterna vita scimus, quæ non sunt condigna passiones huius temporis ad futuram gloriam, nec si vnus omnes sustineat. Neq; enim talia sunt hominum merita, vt propter ea vita æterna debeatur ex iure, aut deus iniuriam aliquam faceret, nisi eam donaret.* Now touching eternall life, we know that the sufferings of this time are not worthy of the glorie to come; no, not if one man could sustaine all. For the merits of men are not such, that for them eternall life is due by right, or that God should doe some iniurie, if he gaue it not. *Bernard. ser. in annunc. B.M.V. pag. 160. tom. 1.*

The same *Bernard* in another place hath these expresse words: *Dees gratiæ, quicquid meritis deputas. Nolo meritum, quod gratiam excludat. Horreo quicquid de meo est, vt sim meus; nisi quod illud magis forsitan meum est, quod me meum facit Gratia reddit me mihi iustificatum gratis, & sic liberatum a seruitute peccati.* It derogateth frō grace, whatsoeuer thou ascribest to merite. I will haue no merite that excludeth grace. I abhorre whatsoeuer is of mine owne, that I may be mine owne, vnlesse perchance that is more mine owne which maketh me mine owne. Grace iustifieth mee to my selfe freely, and so deliuereth me from the bondage of sin. *Bern. in cant. serm. 67. pag. 1003. tom. 1.*

The same *Bernard* in another place hath these expresse words: *Sic non est, quod iam quæras quibus meritis speremus bona, præsertim cum audias apud prophetā: non propter vos, sed propter me ego faciam, dicit dominus. Sufficit ad meritum, scire quod non sufficiant merita. Sed vt ad meritum satis est, de meritis non præsumere: sic carere meritis, satis ad iudicium est.* So there is no cause, that thou shouldest now aske by what merits we hope for glorie, especially, since thou heares the Prophet say, I will doe it, saith the Lord, not for your sake, but for mine owne. It is sufficient to merite, to know that our merites are not sufficient. But as it is ynough to merite, not to presume of merites, so to want merites, is ynough to iudgement. *Bern. in cant. ser. 68. p. 1006*

Out of the most excellent testimonies of this famous Papist,

Papist, I note many worthy lessons for the benefit of the Reader. First, that nothing which man can doe or suffer in this life, is worthy of the ioyes of heauen. Secondly, that heauen is not due to any man for his owne deserts. Thirdly, that God should doe no man wrong, no, not the best liuer on earth, if hee should debarre him from the ioyes of heauen. Fourthly, that whatsoeuer is ascribed to mans merite, the same is derogatorie to Gods grace. Fiftly, that *Bernard* renounceth all merit, which excludeth grace, that is to say, all merit of mans workes whatsoeuer: for so himselfe expoundeth himselfe. Sixtly, that he abhorreth whatsoeuer is his owne, and so he denyeth any thing within himselfe to bee meritorious, or worthy of eternall life. Seuenthly, that the most sufficient merite in man, is this, *viz.* to know and confesse, that our merits are no merits indeed. Eightly, that to want merits, is ynough for mans condemnation. Which last obseruation doth fitly expound that which I vttered in the beginning of this article, to wit, that the word (merite) in that sence in which the Fathers vse it, is not to bee reiected, though in these our daies it commonly be abused. For to want merits in their sence (as *Bernard* here declareth euidently) is to haue no good workes: which good works I affirme willingly, both with the old and late writers of best acccount, to be so necessarie to attaine eternall life, as the vsuall, ordinarie, and vndoubted meanes, by which God decreed from eternitie freely for his owne name sake, to bring his chosen and elect to saluation; that without the same, none haue beene, are, or shall be saued world without end; if, as I said in the beginning, time be graunted to doe them.

The third reason, drawne from the doctrine of the best approoued Papists, and their renowned schoole-doctors.

Aquin. 12. q. 114. art. 1. in corp.

THomas *Aquinas* (whose doctrine no Papist may gainesay or refuse) hath these expresse words: *Manifestũ est autem, quod inter deũ & hominem est maxima inæqualitas, in infinitum enim distant; totum quod est hominis bonum, est à deo;*

vnde

vde non potest hominis à deo esse iustitia secundum absolutam aqualitatem, sed secundum proportionem quandam; in quantum scilicet vterq; operatur secundum modum suum. Modus autem & mensura humanæ virtutis homini est à Deo, & ideo meritum hominis apud deũ esse non potest, nisi secundum presuppositionẽ diuinæ ordinationis; ita scilicet, vt id homo consequatur à Deo per suam operationem quasi mercedem, ad quod Deus ei virtute operandi destinauit. It is manifest, that betweene God and man there is exceeding great inequalitie, as which doe differ in infinit; all the good that man hath, is of God. Wherfore mans iustice receiued of God, cannot be according to absolute equalitie, but after a certain proportion, to wit, in as much as either worketh according to his condition. Now, man hath the measure and condition of his vertue from God; and therefore mans merit cannot be with God, saue onely according to the supposall of Gods holy ordinance; so forsooth, that man may attaine that at Gods hand by his working, as a reward, to which God hath designed to him the faultie and power of working.

Thus writeth their grand master Papist *Aquinas*, who vtterly ouerthroweth all popish merit, as it is this day defended and beleeued in the Church of Rome. For first *Aquinas* telleth vs (marke well, for this is a weightie point) that where there is not perfect equalitie, there can bee no merit properly. Secondly, hee graunteth freely, that there is infinite inequalitie betweene God and man, as euerie child knoweth to be true. Thirdly, hee freely confesseth, that mans iustice is not absolute, but imperfect. Fourthly, hee graunteth willingly, that man doth merit nothing in Gods sight, saue onely by way of his free acceptation. Fiftly, he confesseth in like manner, that eternall life is not properly hire, but as it were hire, *quasi mercedem*; and that, by reason of the same free acceptation.

Durandus, a very famous popish Schoole-doctor, hath these expresse words: *Tale meritum de condigno inuenitur inter homines, sed non est hominis ad deum. Quod patet, quã quod redditur potius ex liberalitate dantis, quã ex debito operis, non* *Durand. in 2. sf. dist. 27. q. 2. in med.*

cadit sub merito de condigno strictè & propriè accepto. Sequitur; quod si quis dicat, quod quamuis deus non constituatur nobis debitor ex aliquo nostro opere, constituitur tamen debitor ex sua promissione, quam exprimit scriptura; non valet propter duo. Primum est, quod promissio diuina in scripturis sanctis nõ sonat in aliquam obligationem, sed insinuat meram dispositionem liberalitatis diuinæ. Secundum est, quod quod redditur, non redditur ex debito operis, sed ex promissione precedente; non quod redditur ex merito operis de condigno, sed solum vel principaliter ex promisso. Et ita non est illud debitum, de quo loquimur. Et sic patet, quod meritum de condigno strictè & proprie sumptum, viz. pro actione voluntaria, propter quam operanti debetur merces ex iustitia, sic quod si nõ reddatur, ille ad quem pertinet reddere, iniustè facit, & est simpliciter & propriè iniustus, non est hominis ad deum. Et ideo propter tale meritum, cum sit homini simpliciter impossibile, non est necesse in nobis ponere gratiam, vel charitatem habitualem. Such condigne merit is found among men, but is not betweene God and man. Which hereby is cleere, becauſe that which is rendered rather of the liberalitie of the giuer, than of debt due to the worke, falleth not vnder condigne merit, properly ſo called. If any ſay, that though God become not our debtor by reaſon of our worke, yet is he made our debtor by reaſon of his promiſe, which the Scripture expreſſeth: that anſwere is of no force for two reſpects. Firſt, becauſe Gods promiſe in the Scriptures doth not ſound to any bond, but inſinuateth the meere diſpoſition of Gods liberalitie. Secondly, becauſe that which is giuen, is not giuen for the debt ariſing of the worke, but of promiſe that went before; not that it is rendered for the condigne merit of the worke, but onely or principally for his promiſe ſake. And ſo there is not that debt of which we ſpeake. So then it is cleere, that condigne merit, properly ſo called, *viz.* for a voluntarie action, for which reward is due of iuſtice to the worker, ſo that if it be not rendered, he to whom it appertaineth to giue it, doth vniuſtly, and is ſimply and properly vniuſt, is not betweene God and man. And therefore for ſuch a merit,

ſeeing

seeing it is simply impossible to man, there is no neede to put in vs grace or charitie habituall. Thus saith M. *Durand:* out of whose words I note first, that condigne merit cannot be betweene God and man. Secondly, that eternall life is giuen of Gods free liberalitie, not of any dutie due to the works that we doe. Thirdly, that God rewardeth vs principally for his promise sake, and not for any thing we either haue done or can doe. Fourthly, that condigne merit is so farre aboue mans capacitie, that no man can by any possibilitie haue it. And consequently, that late popish doctrine is impossible.

Gregorius Ariminensis, Marsilius, Thomas Waldensis, Paulus Burgensis, and *Eckius,* fiue most zealous papists, do all with one assent affirme very cõstantly, that mans works are not meritorious of eternall life, how holy soeuer the mã be. *Apud Ioseph. Angl. in 2. sf. dist. 27. art. 2. p. 105.*

Dominicus Soto a zealous Monke and famous popish writer, telleth the papists roundly, and teacheth them grauely, that no pure man is able to make condigne satisfaction for his sinnes; and so *à fortiori,* against his will and meaning, that no man can by condigne merit attaine eternall life. These are his expresse words; *Perfecta satisfactio est illa, cuius valor & pretium totum emanat à debitore, nulla vel perueniente, vel interueniente gratia creditoris; taliter vt sit redditio æquiualentis alias indebiti voluntaria.* Perfect satisfaction is that, whose value and price proceedeth wholly from the debtour, without either preuenting or interuenting grace of the creditour; so as the voluntarie reddition be of that which is equiualent, and not otherwise due. This is true doctrine which our frier *Soto* deliuereth to the world: he teacheth vs foure things. First, that the satisfaction must proceed wholie frõ the debtour. Secondly, that there must be no preuenting nor interuenting grace of the creditour. Thirdly, that there must be equiualent restitution. Fourthly, that that equiualent reddition must be a worke, which is otherwise not due. These foure conditions (which our popish M. *Soto* and *Dominican* frier requireth in euery satisfaction) when any papist can find in any one of their me- *Soto, de nat. & grat. lib. 3. cap. 6. pa. 138.*

rits or satisfactions, I will be their bondman, neither shall the Popes holines be excepted. But to come to this bondage vpon this couenant, I am in no feare at all: For the ethnicke philosopher *Aristotle*, perceiued by the naturall discourse of right reason, That no man can euer make condigne compensation to God and his naturall parents. For which respect, *Aquinas* affirmeth constantly, that God is not simply and truely said to be debtor to vs, but to himselfe and to his owne promise, which he freely without all our deserts made vnto vs. And their great schoole-doctour *Iosephus Angles*, after he hath disputed this question of condigne merit too and fro, *pro & contra*, doth in the end though vnawares, plainely confesse the selfe same doctrine, that I now intend to proue. He telleth vs forsooth, that the price of euery thing may be equall to the value and worth of the same thing, two wayes; first, of the nature of the thing; secondly, of the pact, couenant and promise of him that doth promise the same thing: for saith he, if one penny be the full value answereable to the labour; yet if a greater reward be promised, which farre exceedeth the worth and value of the worke wrought, then that reward is also due by couenant. He addeth the reason thereof; *viz.* because the law of nature teacheth to keepe promises which farre exceed the value of the thing. And hereupon this great learned doctour concludeth roundly, that though our good workes come farre short of eternall life, if we respect the worthinesse thereof: yet doe they condignely merit the ioyes of heauen, if we respect the free promise of Christ Iesus. And this condignitie of workes, our frier bishop, or bishop frier, (as you will) calleth *æqualitas ex promissione tantum*, equalitie of promise onely. Now, I pray thee gentle reader, what childish wit is not able to penetrate the very bowels of this deepe diuinitie? and yet is it the maine point and onely foundation, to which all papists doe and must appeale, in this weighty and most important question. For example sake, if thou wouldest wish me to lend thee my cloake, to

Aristot. in 8. ethnic. cap. 7.

Aquin. 12. q. 114. ar. 1. 3. m.

Iosephus Angles, in 2 sent. pag. 107.

defend

defend thee from a showre of raine, and promise to giue me an hundred pounds for the loane; then doubtlesse were it true to say, that after such loane an hundreth pounds were due vnto me: yet withall would it be most true also, that such loane of my cloake were not the condigne merit of that hundreth pounds; but that it proceeded principally of the free gift and promise made vnto me, farre aboue my merit and desert: neither could my act be any way rightly tearmed, the condigne merit of that reward. And yet it is euident, that thus standeth the state of the question, betweene the condigne merit of mans workes, and the excellencie of the ioyes of heauen. For I willingly graunt, that eternall life is due to the workes of Gods elect, and that it is as well the crowne of iustice, as of mercie: but withall I constantly affirme, that God bestoweth it on his elect freely for his owne name sake, and not for any merit, worthinesse, or condignitie of their workes. 2. *Tim.* 4 *v.* 8. *Iac.* 1. *v.* 12. *Rom.* 8. *v.* 18. *Rom.* 6. *v.* 23. *Psa.* 103. *v.* 4. *Psal.* 145. *v.* 9. *Iac.* 2. *v.* 83.

For this cause, their owne deere frier *Ioannes de Combis*, teacheth this golden lesson: *Meritum condigni dicit aequalitatem meriti ad remunerationem: dico autem aequalitatem, non arithmeticam, sed geometricam: id est, non quantitatis, sed proportionis. Et hoc patet, quia Deus semper remunerat supra meritum, sicut punit citra condignum.* Condigne merit doth connotat the equalitie of merit, to the thing that is merited; I say equalitie, not arithmeticall, but geometricall, that is, not of quantitie, but of proportion: And this is euident, because God euer rewardeth aboue our merits, as he punisheth lesse than we deserue. Out of these words we see two things cleered: the one, that we deserue greater punishment for our sinnes, than God inflicteth vpon vs for the same: the other, that for our well doing we receiue greater reward, than our workes doe or can deserue. And consequently, that wee doe not condignely merit eternall life. *Ioan de Combis lib.* 5. *theol. ver. t. cap.* 11.

For this cause saith their famous popish doctour, *Nicolaus de Lyra*, in this manner: *Salus enim aeterna, excedit totaliter facultatē naturae humanae. Propter quod nō potest eam attingere, nisi* *Lyra in* 3. *ca. tit.*

nisi ex largitate diuina misericordia. For eternall life doth farre surmount and wholly exceed the faculties and power of mans nature. Wherefore man can no way attaine vnto it, but onely by the liberalitie of Gods mercy.

Carthus. in 6. cap. ad Rom.

For this cause saith another popish doctor, *Dionysius Carthusianus*, in this maner: *Ex gratia seu per gratiam Dei, datur iustis pro præmio vita æterna. Non hoc dicitur merita excludendo, sed vt insinuetur, quod principaliter ascribendum sit gratiæ Dei, qui etiam premiat vltra condignum.* Eternall life is giuen for reward to the iust, of grace or through the grace of God. This is not said to exclude merits, but to insinuate, that reward must principally be ascribed to the grace of God, who rewardeth vs aboue our deserts. Loe, this great papist laboreth with maine and might, to stablish popish condigne merit of workes: who affirming more boldly than wisely, that the elect doe merit eternall life; telleth vs with one breath, that the reward is aboue our merits and deserts. And so vnwittingly and vnwillingly he confuteth himselfe, and refelleth that doctrine, which he gladly would confirme.

To conclude, our Iesuit and renowmed Cardinall, frier *Bellarmine*, who after mature deliberation and graue consultation had with all the best learned Iesuits in the world, and with the Pope himselfe (whose faith iudiciall cannot faile, say they) saith all that possibly can be said for the life of poperie, doth with great grauitie and prudent sagacitie in the name of all papists, deliuer this doctrine vnto vs;

Bellarm. de iustific. tom. 3. col. 1296. & col. 1298.

Quod vero attinet ad rem ipsam, Durandi sententia, si nihil aliud vellet, nisi merita nostra non esse ex condigno, sine ex iustitia absolutè, sed tantum ex hypothesi, id est, posita liberali Dei promissione, non esset reprobanda, sequitur; respondeo, absolutè non posse hominem à Deo aliquid exigere, cum omnia sint ipsius; tamen posita eius voluntate & pacto, quo nõ vult exigere à nobis opera nostra gratis, sed mercedem reddere iuxta proportionem operum, verè possumus ab eo mercedem exigere; quomodo seruus nõ potest absolutè à domino suo vllũ præmiũ postulare, cũ omnia quæ seruus acquirit, domino suo acquirat; tamen si domino placem

ceat donare illi opera sua, & pro ijsdem tanquam sibi non debitis mercedē promittere, iure mercedem pro suis operibus postulabit. Touching the matter it selfe, *Durands* opinion, if he had no other meaning, but that our merits are not absolutely iust and condigne, but hypothetically in respect of Gods liberall promise, were not to be reiected: I answere, that man cannot absolutely exact any thing of God, seeing all things are Gods owne; neuertheleſſe, his will and couenant being made, that he will not exact our workes of vs freely, but will reward them according to their proportion: we may truly require hyer of him, like as a bondman cannot absolutelie require any reward of his lord, seeing euery thing which the bondman gaineth, is gotten and gained to his master: yet for all that, if it shall please his master and lord to bestow his works on him, and to promise reward for the same, as if they were not due vnto him, then may the bondseruant iustly demaund reward for his workes.

Thus saith the Iesuit *Bellarmine*; and consequently, this is all that all papists say, or can say, for the life of popish doctrine. Out of whose wordes I note first, that his brother *Durands* opinion hath put him to his best trumpe. Secondly, that *Durands* opinion (as is alreadie prooued) is this; *viz.* that the merit of workes in the best liuer vpon earth, cannot truly and properly be called *meritum ex condigno*, condigne merit; but onely merit in way of acceptation, and in respect of Gods free mercy, and promise made vnto man without all deserts. Thirdly, that *Bellarmine* graunteth this opinion in this sense: For hee saith plainely, If *Durand* admit merit in respect of Gods promise, his opinion cannot be reproued. Fourthly, that our Iesuit maketh good that doctrine, which I here defend, as which is the selfe same, that *Durand* holdes. And consequently, if *Bellarmine* and his popish fellowes and followers, would stand constantly to their owne doctrine, which they publish in printed bookes; wee and they should soone agree, and these great controuersies would haue

an

an end. Fourthly, that man cannot absolutely exact any thing at Gods hands, because all thinges are Gods owne. Fiftly, that in respect of Gods good pleasure and couenant freely made to man, wee may truely require reward of God. Yea, my selfe graunt, that we may not onely truly, but also iustly require reward at Gods hands, in regard of his promise freely made vnto vs. But I euer denie withall, that any reward is due to our best workes; for any condigne merite or desert of or in our workes, Gods free acceptation, mercie, and promise set apart. For as Saint *Austen* grauely saith; *Væ etiam laudabili vitæ hominum, si remota misericordia discutias eam.* Woe euen to the best liuer vpon earth, if thou examine his life, thy mercie set apart. Answere ô Papists, if ye can; and if ye cannot, then repent, and yeeld vnto the truth for shame. I challenge you, I prouoke you to the combat; I adiure you all ioyntly, and euerie one of you seuerally, for the credite of your cause, for the honour of your Pope, and the life of popish doctrine, which now lyeth bleeding and will shortly yeeld vp the Ghost, if some soueraigne remedie bee not speedily prouided for the same.

Aug. li. 9. confess. cap. 13.

The

The sixt Article. Of the Popish distinction of mortall and *veniall sinnes.*

ALthough it bee true, that all sinnes are not equall, but one greater than another: and although it be also true, that in a good and godly sence, some sinne may be termed mortal, and some veniall; which yet may more fitly be called, sins pregnant, and not regnant: neuertheleſſe moſt true it is, to the euerlasting confusion of all impenitent papists, that euerie sinne is mortall of it owne nature, and onely veniall by way of *Gods* free acceptation and mercie, for his owne name sake, and merits of his deare sonne our Lord Iesus.

I proove it first both briefely and euidently. For Christ himselfe telleth vs in his holy Gospell, that we must giue a straight account of euerie idle word in the generall day of iudgement. And for no other end doubtleſſe must this account be made, but onely, because euerie idle word is flatly against the law of *God*. This the papists can neuer denie, it is euident to euery child. And yet must they likewise confeſſe, that idle words be those sinnes which they call venials. And consequently, they must confes against their wils, and against their professed Romish doctrine, that all sinnes are mortall, that is to say, against the law of God. *Matt.12.v.3.*

This doctrine of our Sauiour Christ Iesus is confirmed by the testimonie of S. *Iohn* his beloued Apostle, where he telleth vs, that euerie sinne is ἀνομία, that is, the transgressi- *1.Iob.3.v.4.*

on of Gods law, as is alreadie prooued at large in the fourth article of concupiscence. And the Hebrew word חטא, which signifieth a declining from the right way, doth plainely confirme the same.

Secondly, because our popish Rhemists confesse in plaine tearmes, that euery sinne is a swaruing from the law of God. For doubtlesse, that which swarueth from the law, is truly said to be against the law, but not agreeable to the law.

Rhemists in 1. Iohn. 3. v. 4.

Thirdly, because the famous popish Frier and Romish bishop *Iosephus Angles* teacheth the same doctrine in his booke dedicated to the Pope himselfe. These are his owne expresse words: *Omne peccatū veniale est alicuius legis trāsgressio. Patet, quia omne veniale est contra rectam rationem, & agere cōtra rectam rationem, est agere contra legem naturalem, precipientem nō esse à regula rectæ rationis deuiandum.* Euery sinne venial is the transgression of some law. This is cleere, because euery veniall sinne is against right reason; and to do against right reason, is to do against the law of nature, which commaundeth vs not to depart or swarue from the rule of right reason. Loe, euery veniall sinne is against right reason, and against the law of nature, which is giuen to euery one in his creation, in his birth or natiuitie.

Ioseph. Angles in 4. sent. pag. 215.

Fourthly, because *Durandus*, another famous papist, confuteth the late receiued popish opinion of *Thom. Aquinas*, which the Pope and his Iesuits hold, to wit, that veniall sinnes are *preter legem, non contra:* Besides the law, but not against the law. These are *Durands* owne words: *Ad argumentum dicendum, quod omne peccatum est cōtra legem dei naturalem, vel inspiratam, vel ab eis deriuatam.* To the argumēt answere must be made, that euery sinne is against the law of God, either naturall, or inspired, or deriued frō them. And this opinion of M. *Durand*, is this day cōmonly defended in the popish Vniuersities and Schooles. So saith Frier *Ioseph*, these are his words: *D. Thomas & eius sectatores tenent, peccatum veniale non tam esse contra legem, quam preter legem. Sequitur; Durandus tamen & alij permulti hanc sententiam impug-*

Duran. in 2. sent. dist. 42. q. 6.

Ios. Angl. in 2. s. pag. 275.

impugnant, affirmantes peccata venialia esse contra mandata. Et hæc opinio modo in scholis videtur communior. S. *Thomas* and his followers hold, that a veniall sinne is not so much against the law, as besides the law. But *Durand* and many others impugne this opinion, auouching veniall sinnes to be against the commaundements. And this opinion seemeth now adaies to be more common in the schooles.

Heere I wish the reader to note by the way, out of the word (*modo*, now adaies) the mutabilitie of Romish religion. For in that he saith (*modo*, now adaies) he giueth vs to vnderstand, that their doctrine is now otherwise than it was of old and in former ages. A note worthie to be remembred. For the old Romane religion was catholicke, pure, and sound, and with it doe not I contend: but I impugne late Romish faith and doctrine, which the Pope and his Romish Schoole-men haue brought into the Church.

Fiftly, because their canonized martyr *Iohn Fisher*, the late Bishop of Rochester, teacheth the same doctrine so plainely, as euery child must needs perceiue the truth in that behalfe. These are his expresse words: *Quod peccatum veniale solum ex dei misericordia veniale sit, in hoc tecum sentio.* That a veniall sinne is onely veniall through the mercie of God (and not of it owne nature) therein do I agree vnto you. Thus saith our Bishop. And as he telleth me, that he agreeth with *Luther* therein: so doe I tell our Iesuites, that I agree with him, with *Durand*, *Almaine*, and the other papists, that teach the same doctrine. *Roffensis art. 32. adu. Luth.*

Sixtly, because *Gerson*, another famous popish writer, holdeth the same opinion. These are his expresse words: *Nulla offensa dei est venialis de se, nisi tantum modo per respectum ad diuinam misericordiam, qui nō vult de facto quamlibet offensam imputare ad mortem, cum illud posset iustissimè. Et ita cōcluditur, quod peccatum mortale & veniale in esse tali, non distinguuntur intrinsecè & essentialiter, sed solum per respectum ad diuinam gratiam, quæ peccatum istud imputat ad pœnam mortis, & aliud non.* No offence of God is veniall of *Io. Ger. de vita spiritual. lect. 1. part. 3. in 1. corol.*

it owne nature, but only in respect of Gods mercie, who will not *de facto*, impute euery offence to death, though he might do it most iustly. And so I conclude, that mortall and veniall sinnes, as they be such, are not distinguished intrinsecally and essentially, but onely in respect of Gods grace, which assigneth one sinne to the paine or torture of death, and not another.

Thus writeth this famous popish bishop, who was a man of high esteeme in the Counsell of *Constance*. Whose onely testimonie (if his words be well marked) is able to confound the papists, and to strike them dead. For first, he telleth them plainely, that euery sinne is mortall of it owne nature. Secondly, that no sinne is veniall, saue onely in respect of Gods mercie. Thirdly, that God may most iustly (*iustissimè*) condemne vs for the least sinne we doe. Note seriously, gentle reader, the word (*iustissimè*.) Fourthly, that mortall and veniall sinnes are the same intrinsecally and essentially, and differ but accidētally, that is to say, they differ in accident, but not in nature; in quantitie, but not in qualitie; in mercy, but not in deformitie; in the subiect, but not in the obiect; in imputation, but not in enormitie; saue only, that the one is a greater mortall sinne than is the other. For (as *Gerson* auoucheth) we may iustly be damned for the least sinne of all, howsoeuer other papists do flatter themselues in their cursed deformed venials.

Seuenthly, because sinne in generall is the transgression of Gods law, as *S. Ambrose* defineth it, yea, euery word, deed, or desire against Gods law, as *S. Austen* describeth it. Their words are set downe in the fourth article of this discourse.

Eightly, because the Iesuit *Bellarmine* vnawares confesseth the same against himselfe. These are his owne words:

Bellar. tom. 1. pag. 804. *Respondeo, omne peccatum esse contra legem dei, non positiuam, sed æternam, vt Aug. rectè docet. Omnis enim iusta lex, siue à deo, siue ab homine detur, ab æterna dei lege deriuatur. Est enim æterna lex, vt malum sit violare regulam.* I answere, that euery sinne is against the law of God, not positiue, but eternall

ternall, as *Austen* teacheth rightly. For euery iust law, whether it be giuen of God, or of man, is deriued from the eternall law of God. For the eternall law is, that it is euill to offend against the rule. These are our Iesuites owne words, which (as euery child can easily discerne) doe euidently confute himselfe and his Romish doctrine. For first, vnder euery sinne must needs be contained their veniall sinnes, or els some sinnes shall be no sinnes; which implieth flat contradiction. Secondly, he telleth vs, that euery sinne, and consequently veniall sinnes are against the eternall law of God. Thirdly, he graunteth, that they are not onely besides the law, *sed contra legem*, but euen against the law. Fourthly, hence it is cleere and euident, that the law eternall is the chiefe and principall law of all other lawes, seeing from it all other lawes are deriued.

Ninthly, because the papists cannot possibly yeeld any sound reason, why in the sinnes of theft one shall be mortall, and another veniall. For example sake, let vs suppose one at one time to steale so many egs as will make a mortall sinne by Romish doctrine; another at another time to steale so many as will make a veniall sinne by the same doctrine: then I demaund of our papists, Why God cannot iustly condemne the theefe to hell that stealeth but so many egs; and for all that can iustly condemne him to eternall torment, that stealeth but one onely egge aboue the said number. For this must they doe, and a good reason hereof must they yeeld (which I am well assured they can neuer do) or els confesse euery sinne to be mortall, and so against their wils to subscribe to mine opinion. Answere ô papists if ye can; if ye cannot, then repent for shame, and yeeld vnto the truth.

The seuenth Article. Of popish vnwritten traditions.

THe Papists beare the world in hand, that many things necessarie for mans saluation, are not conteined in the holy scriptures of the old and new testament: and consequently, that none can be saued, but such as beleeue their vnwritten traditions, and what their Pope telleth them. For the exact knowledge whereof, I put downe these propositions.

The first Proposition, with the first reason.

THe written word or holy scripture, containeth in it selfe, euery doctrine necessarie for mans saluation. I prooue it, by the manifold texts both of the old and new testament; by the authoritie of the holy fathers, and by the testimonie of renowned and best approoued popish writers.

Ex testamento veteri.

Locus primus. Ye shall not add to the word which I speak vnto you, neither shall ye take any thing away from it. *Deut.4.v.2.*

Againe thus, That which I command, that only doe thou to the Lord. Neither add any thing, nor take any thing away. Againe thus, Only be thou strong, and of a valiant courage, that thou mayest obserue and doe according to all the law, which *Moses* my seruant hath cõmanded thee. Thou shalt not turne away from it, neither to the right hand nor to the left. Bee carefull that yee keepe all things which are writtẽ in the booke of the law of *Moses*; *Deu.12.v.32.* *Ios.1.v.7.* *Ios.23.v.6.*

that

that ye decline not from them, neither to the right hand nor to the left.

By these manifold texts we may see euidently, that the holy scriptures are most perfect, and that nothing may bee taken from them, neither any thing added to them. But doubtlesse, if all doctrine necessarie for mans saluation, were not sufficiently conteined in them, then of necessitie, many things should be added to them. *Bellarmine* (the mouth of all papists) answereth to these and the like places, that they are not spoken of the written word precisely, but of Gods word generally, which is partly written, and partly vnwritten. *Non ait, inquit ille, ad verbum quod scripsi, sed quod ego precipio.* He saith not, (quoth our Iesuite) to the word which I haue written, but which I command. But doubtlesse, this is a miserable shift, and a very childish answere. For first, God himselfe wrote his owne wordes in two tables of stone, and then deliuered them to *Moses*. Yea, after *Moses* had broken the said tables, in his vehement zeale against Idolatrie; God commanded *Moses* to hew two other tables of stone like to the first, in which he writ againe the wordes that were in the first tables, and commanded *Moses* to put them vp in an arke of wood. Secondly, *Moses* expounded the law of God to the Israelites at large. Which large explication of the law, God himselfe commanded him to write, and to giue the same to the Israelites; that they might put it in the side of the arke of the couenant, and there keepe it for a witnesse against them. Thirdly, God commanded *Iosue* to keepe and obserue all things, which were written in the booke of the law, which *Moses* had deliuered to the Leuites: charging him to meditate therein day and night, that he might doe according to the same. Fourthly, *Moses* telleth vs expresly, that the two tables written with the finger of God, contained all the wordes, which the Lord spake to them in the mount out of the midst of the fire, in the day of the assembly. Fiftly, God commanded that the king of the Israelites, so soone as he should be establi-

Bellarm. to. 1. col. 183. A. B.

Deut. 5. 22.

Deut. 9. 17. & 10. v. 1, 4

Deut. 1. 5.

Deu. 31. v. 19. 24.

Ios. 1. v. 8.

Deut 9. v. 10.

shed

Deu. 17. v. 18. shed in his throne, should write out the Deutronomie (or law repeated) in a Booke; according to the example, which the priests of the Leuiticall tribe should giue him, that hee might meditate therein all the dayes of his life. Sixtly,

Ios 24. v. 25. 26. *Iosue* made a couenant with the people, and gaue them a law in Sichem, and wrote all the wordes in the Booke of the law. Which wordes were nothing else but a repetition of the couenant written by *Moses*; which couenant

Ios. 1. v. 7. Deut 5. 1. per totum. Deut. 11. 1. *Iosue* was commanded to obserue so strictly, that he might neither decline to the right hand, nor to the left. And the same law contained all those precepts, ceremonies, and iudgements, which God commaund *Moses* to teach the people of Israell.

Prou. 30. v. 6. *Locus secundus. Ne addas quicquam verbis eius (Dei) ne forte arguat te, & inueniaris mendax.* Thou must adde nothing to Gods words, lest he reproue thee, and thou be found a lyer. This text Saint *Hierome* vnderstandeth of the holy scriptures, to which no man may adde any thing, bee it more, be it lesse. The scriptures therefore are most perfect and absolute, and containe euerie doctrine needefull for vs to know.

Esa. 8. v. 20. *Locus tertius. Ad legem magis, & ad testimonium: Quod si non dixerint iuxta verbum hoc, non erit eis matutina lux.* To the law, and to the testimonie. If they speake not according to this word, there is no matutine or true light in them.

Loe, they that refuse to be taught of Gods prophet, who is the mouth of God; and seeke helpe at the dead, which is the illusion of Satan; are here reprooued as men voide of knowledge, and as blinde leaders of the blinde. And withall they are charged to seeke remedie in the word of God, where his will is declared. They and wee must euer in all doubts and difficulties, haue continuall recourse to the lawe of God; which law is here tearmed the testimonie, because it is the testification of Gods will toward man; because there is set downe, what God requireth of vs; because we may finde in it, whatsoeuer is necessary for vs to know. For the Prophet ioineth the testimonie

monie with the law, not as a thing distinct from it, but as an explication of the same. As if he had sayd, ye must in all doubts haue recourse to the lawe of God, because it is the testimonie of his holy will. Saint *Hierome* yeeldeth the like sense, and interpretation of this place; these are his words. *Si vultis nosse quæ dubia sunt, magis ve legi & testimonijs tradite scripturarum. Quia si nolueris vestra congregatio verbum domini quærere, non habebit luce veritatis, sed versabitur in erroris tenebris.* If ye will know the thinges that are doubtfull, ye must haue recourse to the law, and to the testimonies of the Scriptures. For, if your people will not seeke Gods word, they cannot attaine the light of truth, but shall walke in the darkenesse of errour. *Hier. in 8. cap. Esa.*

Locus quartus. Mementote legis Mosis *serui mei, quam mandaui ei in Horeb ad omnem* Israel. Remember the law of *Moses* my seruant, which I commanded to him in Horeb to all *Israel*. Marke these words seriously, because they proue euidently, the question now in hand. For this *Malachias* being the last of Gods Prophets, and foreseeing by the spirite of God, that the Israelites should bee without Prophets a long time, euen till the comming of Christ; doth here exhort them diligently, to be mindfull of the lawe of *Moses*. As if he should say; the time is at hand, when ye shall be destitute of Prophets, and therefore yee must marke well what the Law saith, and doe according to the prescript rule thereof. But what is the reason, why hee maketh no mention of the Prophets? doubtlesse, because all things (as yon haue alreadie heard) are fully comprised in the written word of the Lawe. For, although the law and the Prophets were vntill *Iohn*; the one foretelling Christs comming by word, the other by tipes and figures: yet was the doctrine of the Prophets nothing else indeede, but an explication of the law; and consequently, *Malachie* willing the Israelites to remember the law of *Moses*, doth thereby sufficiently insinuat the doctrine of the Prophets, as who are nothing else but the interpreters of *Moses*. For from the law they might neither turne *Mal. 4. v. 4.* *Mat. 11. v. 13*

to the right hand nor to the left. That the law containeth the whole Christian Doctrine, necessarie vnto saluation, two famous popish Doctors (*Lyra* and *Dionysius Carthusianus*) doe testifie: whose words shall be alledged expresly, when I come to the places of the new Testament.

Lyra & Carth. in 23. ca. Mat.

Ex nouo Testamento.

Ioh. 20. v. 30. *Locus primus. Hæc scripta sunt, &c.* These are written that you may beleeue, that Iesus is Christ the sonne of God: and that in beleeuing yee might haue life through his name. Here the Reader must obserue seriously with mee, that this Gospell was written after all other Scriptures of the old and new Testament; euen when the canon of the Scriptures was complet, perfect, and fully accomplished, *viz.* almost an hundred yeares after Christs ascention into heauen, about the fourteenth yeere of the raigne of *Domitianus* then Emperour. Which obseruation being well marked, all the sottish cauils of the Papists will easily be auoided. Now let vs see, how the auncient Fathers doe vnderstand this place of Scripture.

Cyrillus lib. 12 in Ioh. ca. vlt. Saint *Cyrill* hath these words; *Non omnia quæ Dominus fecit, conscripta sunt, sed quæ scribentes tam ad mores quam ad dogmata sufficere putarunt; vt recta fide & operibus ad regnum cœlorum perueniamus.* All thinges which our Lord did, are not written: but those thinges onely, which the writers deemed sufficient, as well for manners as for doctrine; that by a right faith and good life, we may attaine the Kingdome of heauen.

Aug. in Ioan. tract. 49. tom. 9. in initio. Saint *Austen* hath these words; *Cum multa fecisset dominus, non omnia scripta sunt: electa sunt autem quæ scriberentur, quæ saluti credentium sufficere videbantur.* When our Lord had done many thinges, all were not written: but so much was chosen out to be written, as was thought to be sufficient for the saluation of the faithfull.

Loe, gentle Reader, so much is comprised in the holy scriptures, as is necessarie for our saluation, as well in those things which concerne our life and manners, as in thinges concerning faith and doctrine. Which if the Papists will graunt

graunt vs, they may keepe their vnwritten traditions, vntill Gods people haue neede thereof. For I see not, why they should enforce vs to admit them, except they were necessarie, either for faith, or at the least for good maners: both which notwithstanding, not the scriptures onely, but the fathers also doe denie.

Locus secundus. Non enim subterfugi, quo minus annunciarem vobis omne consilium Dei. For I haue not spared to shew vnto you, the whole counsell of God. This portion of scripture, is vnderstood of things pertaining to our saluation; as two famous popish writers, *Nicholaus Lyranus*, and *Dyonisius Carthusianus*, do contest with me. *Act.* 20, *v.* 27.

Carthusianus hath these words; *Sed cum alibi scriptum sit; quis consiliarius eius fuit? sapiens quoq; dixerit; quis homini poterit scire consilium Dei; quomodo potuit* Paulus *omne consilium Dei annuntiare hominibus? & respondendum, quod non simpliciter de omni consilio Dei intendit, sed de omni consilio Dei, quantum ad humanam spectat salutem. Quemadmodum etiam ait saluator; omnia audiui à patre meo, nota feci vobis.* But seeing it is written elsewhere; who hath beene his counseller? and seeing the wise man also saith; what man can know the counsell of God? how could *Paul* shew vnto men, all the counsell of God? answere must be made, that he meaneth not simply of all the counsell of God; but of all the counsell of God, so farre forth as appertaineth to mans saluation. As our Saujour also saith; all things which I heard from my father, I haue notified vnto you. *Carthus. in 20. cap. act. apost.* *Rom.* 11. 34. *sap.* 9.

Lyra teacheth the very same doctrine, I omit his words, for the regard I haue to breuitie. By whose iudgement it is most euident, that the whole counsell of God touching our saluation, is contained in the holy Scriptures. And it will not helpe the papists to answere or say, that all the counsell of God was preached, but not written. For first, the Apostle saith, he was called to be an Apostle, seuered into the Gospell of God, which he had promised afore by his Prophets in the holy Scriptures. Secondly, he auoucheth plainely, that hee taught none other things than *Lyra in 20. cap. act apost.* *Rom.* 1.

Act. 26. v. 22. those which the prophets and *Moses* did say should come to passe. Thirdly, *Lyranus* and *Carthusianus*, two renowmed papists, tell vs, that all necessarie doctrine is contained in the precepts of loue. *Carthusianus* hath these words: *Omnia precepta, documenta, & hortamenta legis ac prophetarum, ordinantur ad horum obseruantiam mandatorum, & virtualiter continentur in eis, sicut conclusiones in primis principijs.* All precepts, documents, and exhortations of the law and the prophets are ordained to the keeping of these commandements, and are virtually contained in them, as conclusions in the first principles.

Carth. in 22. cap. Matt.

Lyra in 22. cap. Matt. *Lyranus* hath these words: *Propter hoc omnia mandata legis & monitiones, non sunt nisi quædam explicationes illorum duorum mandatorum. Quia omnia ordinantur ad dilectionem dei & proximi; & similiter doctrina prophetarum ad hoc ordinatur.* For this cause all the commandements of the law, and all admonitions, are nothing els but certaine explications of these two commaundements. Because all things are ordained to the loue of God and of our neighbour: and in like manner, the doctrine of the prophets is referred to the same end.

Fourthly, the Iesuit *Bellarmine* telleth vs, that the books of the Prophets and Apostles are the infallible rule of faith.

Bellar. tom. 1. col. 2. These are his expresse words: *Illud in primis statuendum erit, Propheticos & Apostolicos libros iuxta mentem ecclesiæ Cath. & olim in Conc. 3. Carthag. & nuper in Conc. Trid. explicatam, verum esse verbum dei, & certam ac stabilem regulam fidei.* This must be set downe for a ground and sure foundation, that the bookes of the Prophets and Apostles, according to the minde of the Catholike Church declared aforetime in the third counsell of Carthage, and of late in the counsell of Trent, is the true word of God, and the sure and stable rule of our faith.

Bellar. tom. 1. col. 4. The same Iesuit in another place hath yet more manifest and cleere words, which are these: *Quare cum sacra scriptura regula credendi certissima tutissimaq; sit, sanus profecto non erit, qui ea neglecta spiritus interni sæpe fallacis, &*

semper

semper incerti iudicio se committerit. Wherefore, seeing the holy Scripture is the most certaine and most secure rule of faith, he is not well in his wits doubtlesse, who hauing neglected the same, shall commit himselfe to the iudgement of the internall spirit, which often deceiueth, and neuer is sure or sound.

These words of our Iesuiticall Cardinall (if they be well marked) will not onely confound himselfe, who elswhere teacheth the contrarie doctrine, but also euidently proue the controuersie now in hand. For first, he saith, that the bookes of the Apostles and Prophets rightly expounded, are the infallible rule of faith. Secondly, that the holy Scripture is the most safe and most secure rule how to beleeue. Thirdly, that he is mad, whosoeuer will giue credit to the inward spirit, and not stay himselfe vpon the written word. All which doubtlesse confound him and his Iesuiticall broode; as who will not relie vpon the written testimonies of Gods truth, but seeke after vnwritten falshoods and vanities, and ground their faith vpon the same.

Fiftly, S. *Austen* teacheth the selfesame truth, when he telleth vs flatly, that nothing is contained in the Gospell and epistles of the Apostles, which is not also comprised in the law and the Prophets. These are his expresse words: *In eo tanta predicatio & prenuntiatio noui testamenti est, vt nulla in euangelica atq; Apostolica disciplina reperiantur, quãnis ardua & diuina præcepta & promissa, quæ illis etiam libris veteribus desint*. In the old testament, the new testament is so largely preached and foreshewed, that nothing can be found in the discipline or doctrine of the Gospell and of the Apostles, although they be hard and diuine precepts and promises, which are wanting in those old bookes. This being so, it followeth of necessitie, that all things needfull to saluation, are contained in the Scriptures. For S. *Paule* preached all the counsell of God; S. *Paules* preachings are contained in the doctrine of the prophets; the doctrine of the prophets is contained in the law; the law was writ-

Aug. contra Adimant. c. 3 tom. 6. pa. 121.

ten with the finger of God; *Ergo à primo ad vltimum*, all things neceſſarie for our ſaluation, are contained in the written word of God.

Locus tertius. Becauſe from thine infancie thou haſt knowne the holy Scriptures, τὰ δυνάμενά σε σοφίσαι εἰς σωτηρίαν. VVhich are able to make thee wiſe vnto ſaluation, through faith which is in Chriſt Ieſus. Thus ſaith S. *Paul*. But doubtleſſe, if ſo much be written as is able to make vs wiſe to ſaluatiō; we ſtand in need of no more, it is ynough. Let the papiſts keepe their vnwritten traditions to themſelues, let vs relie vpon the written truth. Let vs be wiſe vnto ſaluation, contenting our ſelues with that which it pleaſed God to reueale in his written word, and let them be preſumptuous and curious to follow mans inuentions, and to beleeue vnwritten vanities.

2. *Tim*. 3. *v*. 15

The ſecond reaſon, drawne from the authoritie of the holy Fathers.

De diuinis nominib. cap. 1. *in initio*.

Dionyſius Areopagita, who liued in the daies of the Apoſtles, doth liuely deliuer this truth vnto vs in theſe expreſſe words: *Omnino igitur non audendum eſt, quicquam de ſumma abſtruſaq́, diuinitate aut dicere aut cogitare, præter ea quæ nobis diuinitus ſcripturæ diuinæ enuntiarunt*. In no wiſe therefore may we make bold to ſpeake or thinke any thing of the moſt high and ineffable diuinitie, ſaue that only which holy writ hath reuealed to vs from heauen.

S. *Auguſtine*, that gliſtering beame and ſtrong pillar of Chriſts Church, auoucheth plainely, that all things neceſſarie for our ſaluation are contained in the written word, as is alreadie prooued in the former reaſon: and he confirmeth the ſame doctrine in another place, where he hath theſe expreſſe words: *In his enim quæ apertè in ſcripturæ poſita ſunt, inueniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem moreſq́, viuendi; ſpem ſcilicet atq́, charitatem*. For in thoſe things which are plainely ſet downe in the holy Scripture, all things are found which containe faith and manners, that is to ſay, hope and charitie.

Aug. de doctr. Chriſt. lib. 2. *cap*. 6. *& ca*. 9. *tom*. 3.

The

The same *S. Austen* in another place hath these expresse words: *Credo quod etiam hinc diuinorum eloquiorum clarissima authoritas esset, si homo sine dispendio promissæ salutis illud ignorare non posset.* I beleeue, that euen in this point also we should haue most cleere testimonie of holy writ, if a man could not be ignorant thereof, without the losse of his saluation. *Aug. de pecca. merit. & remiss. lib. 2. cap. vlt. tom. 7.*

S. Iraeneus hath these words: *Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ cognouimus, quam per eos, per quos euangelium peruenit ad nos: quod quidem tunc præconiauerunt, postea vero per dei voluntatem in scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei nostræ futurum.* For we knowe the dispensation of our saluation, by thē only by whom the Gospell came to our hands, which Gospell they first preached: but afterward by Gods appointment they deliuered the same vnto vs in writing, that it might be the foundation and pillar of our faith. *Irene. li. 3. ca. 1*

Tertullianus an ancient writer, (who liued aboue 1300. yeares agoe) hath these expresse wordes: *Adoro scripturæ plenitudinem, qua mihi & factorem manifestat, & facta. An autem ex aliqua subiacenti materia facta sint omnia, nusquam adhuc legi. Scriptum esse docent* Hermogenis *officina: si non est scriptum, timeat væ illud adicientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum.* I reuerence the plentitude, fulnesse, and perfection of the scripture: as which shewe th to me, both the maker, and the thinges which are made. But that all things are made of some subiacent matter, I neuer could yet read any where. Let *Hermogenes* his shop shew vs, where it is written. If it be no where written, let him be afraid of that woe which is prouided for them that adde or take away from the Scripture. *Tertull. contra Hermogen. pa. 373.*

Loe (gentle Reader) these three most ancient Fathers doe teach vs many verie excellent documents. First, that we know the dispensation of our saluation by Christs Apostles. Secondly, that wee receiued the Gospell from them. Thirdly, that they first preached the mysteries of our saluation, deliuering the Gospell by word of mouth.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, that afterward they committed the same to writing. Fiftly, that the Scripture was written by Gods owne appointment. Sixtly, that it was written for this end and purpose, That it might be the pillar and foundation of our faith. Seuenthly, that wee may not speake or thinke any thing of God, which wee finde not written in Gods Booke. Eightly, that the holy Scripture is perfect, and containeth all thinges necessarie for vs to knowe. Ninthly, that all such as teach or beleeue any doctrine not contained in the Scriptures, must drinke of the cup of eternall woe for their paines. Let vs proceede and see, what other Fathers of later times tell vs.

Cyprian. ep. 74 ad Pompeium. cont. ep. Steph. col. 229.

S. *Cyprian* (who liued about 249. yeeres after Christ, *viz.* aboue 1300. yeeres agoe) hath these words: *Vnde ista traditio? Vtrumne de dominica & euangelica authoritate descendens? an de Apostolorum mandatis & epistolis veniens? Ea enim facienda esse quæ scripta sunt, deus testatur, & proponit ad Iesum Naue dicens; Non recedet liber legis huius ex ore tuo, sed meditaberis in eo die ac nocte, vt obserues facere omnia quæ scripta sunt in eo. Si ergo aut euangelio præcipitur, aut in Apostolorũ epistolis, aut actibus continetur, obseruetur diuina hæc & sancta traditio.* From whence came this tradition? Did it descend from the authoritie of our Lord, or his Gospell? Or came it from the mandates of the Apostles, or their epistles? For, that those things must be done which are written, God himselfe doth witnesse, & propose to Iesus Naue, saying: The Booke of this lawe shall not depart from thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein night and day, that thou maiest obserue to do all things which are writtẽ in it. If therefore it be either commanded in the Gospell, or be contained in the Epistles, or in the Acts of the Apostles, let this diuine and holy tradition be obserued.

Thus writeth S. *Cyprian*, shewing plainely, that all traditions ought to bee examined by the written word, and nothing to be admitted, which is not contained in the same, or grounded thereupon. Where I note by the way, for the helpe of the Reader, that though *Cornelius*, then

then Bishop of Rome (whome now the Papists tearme Pope and his holynesse) together with the whole nationall synode of all the Bishops of Italie, had made a flat decree touching rebaptization: and though also Pope *Stephanus* his holynesse had confirmed the same decree, and commanded it to be obserued: and thirdly, though our Papists of late daies doe obstinately affirme, that their Pope cannot erre when hee defineth iudicially. Yet this notwithstanding. S. *Cyprian* teacheth and telleth vs plainly and roundly, that in his time the Bishop of Rome had no such authoritie, as this day hee proudly and antichristianly taketh vppon him: for hee roundly withstood the decree of Pope *Stephanus*, who then was Bishop of Rome, and both sharpely reproued him, and contemned his falsely pretended authoritie. And for all that, S. *Cyprian* was euer reputed an holy Bishop in his life time, and a glorious martyr being dead. But if the Bishop of Rome had beene Christs Vicar, and so priuiledged, as our Papists beare the world in hand he is, then doubtlesse S. *Cyprian* must needs haue beene an hereticke, and so reputed and esteemed in the Church of God. For, if any Christian shall this day doe or affirme as S. *Cyprian* did, or publickely denie the *P*opes falsely pretended prymacie in any place, Countrey, territories, or dominions, where poperie beareth the sway, then without all peraduenture he must be burnt at a stake, with fire and faggot for his paines.

Euſ. lb. 7. hiſt. ca. 2. 3. 4.

S. *Athanasius* hath these words: *Sufficiunt sanctæ ac diuinitus inspiratæ scripturæ, ad veritatis iuditionem.* The holy scriptures inspired of God, are sufficient, for the discussion and manifestation of the truth. Where the Reader must obserue with mee, that *Athanasius* contending against the Gentiles, that their Idols were not Gods; and prooving that Christ was true God and true man by the Scriptures; and withall auouching, that the Scriptures were sufficient to decide and determine the controuersie; should haue made a verie foolish argument, and haue concluded nothing at all, if any necessarie truth had beene

Athan. contra gētes, & idola

wanting, and not fully contained in the holy Scriptures.

S. *Epiphanius* hath these wordes: *Nos vnuscuiusq; quæstionis inuentionem, non ex propriis ratiocinationibus dicere possumus, sed ex scripturarum consequentia.* We cannot shew the inuention of euerie question out of our owne proper reasons, but by consequence of the Scriptures.

Epiph. in Ancor. 65.

Cyrillus li. 1. de recta fide ad reg. tom. 2.

S. *Cyrill* hath these words: *Necessarium nobis est diuinas sequi literas, & in nullo ab earum præscripto discedere.* It is necessarie for vs to follow the holy scriptures, and not in the least iot to depart from the prescript rule thereof.

Chrys in Psal. 95 to. 1. prope fi.

S. *Chrysostome* hath these wordes: *Si quid dicatur absq; scriptura, auditorũ cogitatio claudicat, nunc annuens, nunc hæsitans, & interdum sermonem vt friuolum aduersans, interdum vt probabilem recipiens. Verum vbi è scriptura diuina vocis prodijt testimonium, & loquentis sermonem, & audientis animum confirmat.* If anything bee spoken without the scripture, the cogitation of the auditors fayleth, sometime yeelding, sometime staggering, and sometime reiecting the speech as friuolous, sometime receiuing it as probable. But so soone as the testimonie of Gods voice is heard out of the scripture, it confirmeth both the word of the speaker, and the mind of the hearer.

Chrysost. ho 41 in Mat. 22. in opere imperf.

The same S. *Chrysostome* in another place hath these wordes: *Quicquid quæritur ad salutem, totum iam adimpletum est in scripturis.* Loe, these holy Fathers and ancient writers (who all of them liued aboue a thousand and one hundred yeares agoe) teach the selfesame doctrine with the former fathers. They tell vs first, that the holy scripture is sufficient to decide all controuersies. Secondly, that we must affirme or hold no doctrine, but that which we finde in the scriptures. Thirdly, that we must not in the least point of doctrine depart or swarue from the rule of holy scripture. Fourthly, that in the holy Scripture is fully compriſed whatsoeuer is necessarie for mans saluation. But let vs yet heare the verdict of some others.

Ambro. de fide ad Grat. lib. 1. cap. 4. tom. 2.

S. *Ambr.* hath these words: *Non negamus, imò potius horremus hanc vocẽ. Sed nolo argumẽto credas sanctæ imperator, & nostra*

nostræ disputationi. Scripturas interrogemus; interrogemus apostolos; interrogemus prophetas; interrogemus Christum. We denie not, but rather abhorre the word. Yet, holy Emperour, I would neither haue you beleeue our argument, nor our disputation. Let vs aske counsell vpon the scriptures; let vs aske the Apostles; let vs aske the Prophets; let vs aske Christ himselfe, and so know what is the truth.

S. *Basill* hath these words: *Si quicquid ex fide non est, peccatum est, sicut dicit apostolus; fides vero ex auditu, auditus autem per verbum dei; ergo quicquid extra diuinam scripturam est, cum ex fide non sit, peccatum est.* If whatsoeuer is not of faith, be sinne, as the Apostle saith; and if also faith come by hearing, and hearing by the word of God; then doubtlesse, whatsoeuer is not in the holy scripture, the same is sinne, because it is not of faith. *Basilius in ethicis, definit. vlt. prope finem.*

The same S. *Basill* in another place hath these words: *Stemus arbitratu inspirata à deo scriptura; & apud quos inueniuntur dogmata diuinis oraculis consona, illis omnino veritatis adiudicetur sententia.* Let vs be iudged by the scripture, which came from God by inspiration; and whose doctrine shall be found consonant to Gods Oracles, let the truth be iudged to be on their side. *Basilius ad Eustath. medicū, epist. 80.*

S. *Hierome* hath these words: *Hoc quia de scripturis non habet authoritatem, eadem facilitate contemnitur, qua probatur.* This opinion is as easily reiected as it is affirmed, because it hath no authoritie from the scriptures. *Hier. in cap. 23 Matth. Vide Paul. Burgens. in 1. cap. Oseæ.*

The same S. *Hierome* in another place hath these words: *Quomodo narrabit? non verbo, sed scriptura. Videte quid dicat qui fuerunt, non qui sunt: vt exceptis Apostolis quodcunq; aliud postea dicatur, abscindatur, non habeat postea authoritatem. Quamuis ergo sanctus sit aliquis post Apostolos, quamuis disertus sit, non habeat authoritatem. Quoniam dominus narrat in scriptura populorū, & principum horum qui fuerūt in ea.* How shal he shew it? not by word, but by the holy scripture. Mark what he saith, who were, but not who are; to the end, that the Apostles being excepted, whatsoeuer other thing be afterward spokē, it must be reiected, it must haue no authority *Hier. in Psal. 86.*

at all. Wherfore, though a man be holy, though he be learned, yet ſeeing he commeth after the Apoſtles, let him be of no authoritie. For our Lord ſpeaketh to vs in the ſcripture of his people, and of the princes that were therein.

Hier. in Iere. cap 9. tom. 5.

The ſame Saint *Hierome* in an other place hath theſe words; *Ergo nec parentum, nec maiorum error ſequendus eſt, ſed authoritas ſcripturarum, & Dei docentis imperiũ.* Therefore we muſt neither follow the errour of our parents, nor of our aunceſtours, but the authoritie of the ſcriptures, and the commandement of God teaching vs.

The third reaſon, drawne from the authoritie of famous popiſh writers.

Roffenſis art. 37. adu. Luth. pag. 411.

Iohn Frier the late Biſhop of Rocheſter, one highly renowmed amongſt the Papiſts, and with them canonized for a Saint and glorious Martyr, ſo as his authoritie muſt perforce be of credit againſt them, hath theſe expreſſe words; *Scriptura ſacra conclaue quoddam eſt omnium veritatum, quæ Chriſtianis ſcitu neceſſariæ ſunt.* The holy ſcripture is a certaine ſtore-houſe of all truths, which are needfull to be knowne of Chriſtians.

Roffenſ. adu. art. Luther. verſ. 4.

In another place the ſame famous Papiſt hath theſe words; *Contendentibus itaq́ nobiſcum hæreticis, nos alio ſubſidio noſtrã oportet tueri cauſam, quam ſcripturæ ſacræ.* Therefore when heretiques contend with vs, we muſt defend our cauſe by other meanes, than by the holy ſcripture. Theſe are the very expreſſe words of their owne famous popiſh Biſhop, of their holy Saint, of their glorious Martyr; who laboured with might and maine for the Popes vſurped ſoueraintie, and defended the ſame in the beſt manner he was able. And yet for all that, he hath bolted out vnawares and againſt his will, (ſuch is the force of truth, which muſt needs in time preuaile) ſo much in plaine tearmes, as is ſufficient to ouerthrow all poperie for euer, and to cauſe all people that haue any care of their ſaluation, to renounce the Pope and his abhominable doctrine to their liues end. For firſt, our popiſh biſhop telleth vs plainely,

plainely, and without all dissimulation, (his mouth being now opened by him that caused *Balaams* asse to speake) That in the holy scripture, as in a plentifull store-house, is laid vp for vs and our instruction, all knowledge necessarie for mans saluation. Againe, the same popish bishop, Saint, and Martyr, (of papists so esteemed and reputed) telleth vs roundly, That they must not (because forsooth they cannot) defend and maintaine their poperie by the authoritie of the scripture, but by some other way and meanes, to wit, by mans inuentions and popish vnwritten vanities, which they tearme the Churches traditions. Now gentle reader, how can any papist (who is not giuen vp in *reprobum sensum* for his iust deserts) read such testimonies against poperie, freely confessed and published to the world by papists, euen when they bestirre themselues busily to maintaine their Pope and his popish doctrine; and for all that continue papists still, and bee carried away headlong into perdition; beleeuing and obeying that doctrine, which cannot be defended by the written word of God, which is the store-house of all necessarie knowledge? They doubtlesse are either very senseleſſe, or so blinded for their former sinnes, that they cannot behold the sunne shining at noone tide: me thinks they should be ashamed, to hold and beleeue that doctrine; in defence whereof, they can yeeld no better reasons. But let vs yet heare what other renowmed popish writers tell vs; who doubtlesse will not bewray their owne cause, but against their wils. Howbeit as the wise man saith, *Magna est veritas, & prævalet*; The truth is of such force as it must needs preuaile, and in time haue the vpper hand.

Numer.ca.22. v.28.

Rom.1.v.24.

2.Thes.2.v.12 Rom.1.v.24.

3.Esdr.4. v.42.

Melchior Canus another popish bishop, and a very learned schoole-doctor, hath these expresse words; *Cum sit perfectus scripturarum canon, sibiq; ad omnia satis superq; sufficiat; quid opus est, vt ei sanctorum & intelligentia iungatur, & authoritas.* Seeing the canon of the scripture is perfect, and most sufficient of it selfe to euery end, and in euery respect;

Melch.Canus de locis theol. lib.7.cap.3.

what neede haue we to ioyne therewith, either the exposition or the authoritie of the fathers. Thus writeth this great learned papist, not denying the sufficiencie of the holy scripture, but requiring the commentaries of the fathers, for the better vnderstanding of the same. Whose opinion I do approue and commend in that respect, as is euident to all that shall peruse my booke of Motiues.

Aquinas, p.1. q.36. art.2. ad primum.

Thomas Aquinas, (whom the Pope hath cannonized for a Saint, and his doctrine for authenticall) teacheth vs not to beleeue any thing concerning God, sauing that only which is contained in the scripture expressly, or at least significantly. These are his owne words: *Dicendum, quod de Deo dicere non debemus, quod in sacra scriptura non inuenitur, vel per verba, vel per sensum.* We must answere, that nothing is to be verified of God, which is not contained in holy writ, either expressly, or in sense.

Aquinas, p.3. q.42. art.4. ad primum.

The same popish doctour in an other place hath these words: *Quicquid enim ille (Christus) de suis factis & dictis nos legere voluit, hoc scribendum illis tanquam suis manibus imperauit.* For whatsoeuer Christ would haue vs to reade of his doings and sayings, the same he commaunded his Apostles to write, as if he had done it with his owne hands. Loe, in these words *Aquinas* auoucheth very plainely, that all things necessarie for our saluation, are contained in the scriptures. For in Christs deeds, are contained his myracles, his life, his conuersation: in his sayings semblably, are contained his preaching, his teaching, his doctrine, and consequently, whatsoeuer is necessary for vs to know. If then this be true, as it is most true, (for the papists neither will, nor can denie the doctrine of *Aquinas*) that whatsoeuer Christ would haue vs to know, of his miracles, of his life, of his conuersation, of his preaching, of his teaching, of his doctrine, the same is now written in the scriptures: no man doubtlesse, but he that will *cum ratione insanire*, can denie all things necessarie for our saluation, to be contained in the holy scriptures.

See the Iesuit *Bellarmines* doctrine, in the end of the second exposition, and note it well.

To this doctrine deliuered by *Aquinas*, agreeth their owne

owne renowmed professor, and most learned Schoole-Doctor *Franciscus a victoria*, that Spanish Frier. His expresse words are these; *Non est mihi certum, licet omnes dicant, quod in scriptura non continetur.* I doe not thinke it certaine and sure, although all writers affirme it, which is not contained in the scripture. *Vict. de pag. 120.*

The same popish Doctor and Frier, in another place hath these words: *Propter quas (opiniones) nullo modo debemus, discedere à regula & synceritate scripturarum.* For which opinions we must by no meanes depart from the rule and syncerities of the holy scriptures. Loe (gentle Reader) our popish Frier will beleeue no doctrine, which is not contained in the scripture; although all writers teach the same. Mad men therefore may they be deemed, that will beleeue whatsoeuer the Pope telleth them, though it be neuer so repugnant to the scripture. *Victor. relect. 8. de augment. charit. p. 308.*

Anselmus and *Lyra* two other famous popish writers, doe teach vs the selfe same doctrine. *Vide in Ansel. in 2. tim. cap. 3 & Lyran. in matt. 19.*

The second Proposition.

All persons of what sexe, state, calling, or condition soeuer they be, may lawfully, and ought seriously to read the holy scriptures; as out of which, euen the simplest of all may gather so much as is necessarie for their saluation. This I say, against that popish, ridiculous, vnchristian, and verie pestilent abuse, where the Pope deliuereth to the people, as it were by way of apostolicall tradition; the scriptures, sacraments, and Church-seruice, in a strange tongue to them vnknowne. Which to be flatly against the practise of the primitiue Church, I haue prooued copiously in my Booke of Suruey. Here therefore I will onely shew, that it is both lawfull and necessarie for all sorts of people that desire to attaine eternall life, to read diligently the holy Scriptures.

S. Chrysostome discourseth at large of this subiect in many places of his workes; but I will content my selfe with some few for the present. In his commentaries vpon S. *Paul* he hath these words: *Et vos itaq; si lectioni cum animi alacritate volueritis attendere, nullo alio præterea opus habebitis.* *Chryso. in proæmio epist. ad Rom.*

Verus

Verus enim est sermo Christi, cum dicit; querite & inuenietis, pulsate & aperietur. Verum quia plures ex iys qui huc cõuenere, & liberorum educationem, & vxoris curam, gubernandaq; domus in sese receperunt, atq; ideo non sustinent totos se labori isti addicere. saltem ad percipienda quæ alij colligerunt, excitamini: tantum iys quæ dicuntur audiendis impendite diligentiæ, quantum colligendis pecunijs. Tametsi enim turpe sit non nisi tantum a vobis exigere, tamen contenti erimus, si vel tantum præstetis. Nam hinc innumera malanata sunt, quod scriptura ignorantur. Hinc erupit multa illa hæreseon pernicies; hinc vita dissoluta, hinc inutiles labores: quemadmodum enim qui luce ista priuati sunt, recta vtiq; non pergunt: ita qui ad radios diuinarum. Scripturarum non respiciunt, multa coguntur continuò detinquere, vtpote in longe pejoribus tenebris ambulantes; quod ne nobis vsu veniat, oculos ad splendorem Apostolicorum verborum aperiamus. If therefore you will read the Scriptures with alacritie of minde, you shall neede no other helpe at all. For Christs word is true, when he saith: Seeke, and ye shall find; knocke, and it shall be opened vnto you. But because many of you are charged with wiues, children, and domesticall regiment, and so cannot wholly addict your selues to this studie: yet at the least be readie to heare what others haue gathered, and bestow so much diligence in hearing what is sayd, as you doe in scraping worldly goods together. For, albeit it bee a shame to require no more of you, yet will I be content, if ye doe so much. For, the cause of infinit euils, is your ignorance in the Scriptures: From hence springeth the manifold mischiefe of heresies; from hence, dissolute life; from hence, vaine and vnprofitable labours. For, euen as they that are bereaued of this light, cannot goe the right way: so they that doe not behold the beames of the holy scriptures, are enforced incontinently to offend in many things, as walking in farre greater darkenesse.

This is the golden censure of Saint *Chrisostome*, rightly surnamed the golden mouthed Doctor. Out of whose doctrine, I gather these worthy obseruations: First, that whosoeuer

whosoeuer studieth the Scriptures seriously, and with alacritie, shall finde therein, and vnderstand so much, as is necessarie for his saluation. And consequently, that our disholy Father the Pope, debarreth vs of the ordinarie meanes of our saluation; when hee vpon paine of excommunication, inhibiteth vs to read the Scriptures in our vulgar tongue, vnlesse we haue his licence and dispensation so to doe. And hee hath I confesse, some reason thus to deale: because forsooth Poperie would haue a short reigne, if euerie Papist might freely reade the holy Scripture, and other godly Bookes written for their instruction. But alasse, they are so bewitched with his blessings, that they thinke they shalbe damned, if they doe but read this my discourse, or any other opposite to Poperie, not hauing his license so to doe. But all his Priests are licenced; and so they can pretend no excuse, if they doe not frame some answere hereunto.

Secondly, that it is a verie shame, for men charged with wiues, children, and familie; that they doe but onelie heare Sermons, and doe not withall studie the holy Scriptures; and consequently, that it is much more shame for others that be more free, not to read them diligently; and greatest shame of all for a Bishop, to approue or commend them that will so doe.

Thirdly, that heresies, dissolute life, and all other euils, doe proceede of ignorance, and of not reading the holy Scriptures.

The same S. *Chrysost.* in another place hath these words: *Propterea obsecro, vt subinde huc veniatis, & diuinæ scripturæ lectionem diligenter auscultetis; nec solum cum huc venitis, sed & domi diuinas biblias in manus sumite, & vtilitatē in illis positam magno studio suscipite. Sequitur Paulo inferius. Tantum igitur lucrum oro, ne per negligentiam amittemus, sed & domi vacemus diuinarum scripturarum lectioni, & hic presentes non in nugis & inutilibus colloquijs tempus decoquamus.* I beseech you therefore, that you will come hither now and then, and *Chrysost. in 9. ca. genes. hom. 29. tom. 1.*

attend diligently the reading of the holy scriptures; neither that onely when ye come hither, but at home also take the holy bibles into your hands, and with great studie embrace the profit contained in them. I pray you therefore, let vs not negligently loose so great gaine, but when we are at home, let vs then apply our selues to reade the holy scriptures: and being here, let vs not spend our time idlely and vainely.

By these testimonies, (to omit many others) we may perceiue most euidently, how grieuously Saint *Chrysostome* lamenteth, that the people in his time were so negligent in reading the holy scripture. What therefore would that holy father say, if he liued in these our daies, in which the Pope burneth such scriptures, as the people vnderstand in their vulgar tongue: In which hee commaundeth all church-seruice to be in straunge and vnknowne language: In which he excommunicateth all lay-persons be they neuer so well learned, that reason of matter of faith, or dispute of his power? What would he say, if he heard priests pronounce absolution in their popish sacrament of penance, which neither the penitents, nor the priests themselues doe often vnderstand? Nay, what would he say, if he were this day in popish Churches, where they doe not onely reade their Church-seruice in Latine, but also Latine homilies or sermons vnto the vulgar sort; which yet they tearme an exposition of the scripture: which maner of proceeding is practised euery festiuall day of nine lessons, in the time of their mattens? In fine, what would he say, if he knew the rude vulgar sort, who are commaunded to heare the Gospell read in Latine, and withall should see them listening with their eares, least any word should not be heard, though impossible of them to be vnderstood? would he not, and might he not iustly say with the holy Apostle, that they were mad? Yes doubtlesse, it cannot be denied.

Decret. lib 5. cap. quicunque.

2. Cor. 14. v. 23.

Origen, who liued aboue a thousand and three hundred yeeres

yeares agoe, doth not onely exhort the people seriously to reade the scriptures, but withall sheweth plainely, that in his time they were read in the vulgar tongue. These are his words: *Certè, si non omnia possumus, saltem ea quæ nunc docentur in ecclesia, vel quæ recitantur, memoriæ commendemus.* Doubtlesse, if we cannot beare away all things contained in the scriptures, yet at the least let vs remember those things which are taught and read in the Church. Loe, in these golden words he speaketh not onely of Sermons, but also of the Gospels, Epistles, Prayers, Lessons, and histories of the Bible. For sermons are contained in the word (*docentur*, which are preached;) and the rest in the word (*recitantur*, which are read or rehearsed:) but certes, if such things had beene read in a strange and vnknowne tongue, the vulgar sort could not haue committed them to memorie. And consequently, to no end or purpose should *Origen* haue made this exhortation. And the obiection which is common in the mouthes of our papists, That Saint *Peter* affirmeth the scriptures to be obscure and hard to bee vnderstood (notwithstanding the great brags, and insolent vaunts of our Rhemists) is too too foolish, and of no force at all. For first, Saint *Peter* saith not, that the whole scripture is hard to be vnderstood, but some things in S. *Paules* Epistles. Secondly, hee speaketh not solely and barely of the vnlearned, but of the vnlearned which are vnstable. Thirdly, hee speaketh not generally of all readers of the scripture, but of those wicked ones, which depraue not onely Saint *Paules* Epistles, but also all other scriptures, to their owne perdition. Howbeit, to debarre all the godly, who with all humilitie and reuerence desire to reade the scriptures; and to abandon one onely particular euill, by taking away the good wholly and generally; may well be resembled to those vnskilfull physitions, who cannot deliuer their patients from any particular disease, except they take away their liues. But wise *Salomon* was of another minde, when he affirmed all the

Origen hom. 4. de super lauit. pro finem.

Rhemist. in 2. Pet. cap. 3.

Vide D. Chrysost. in præmio epist. ad Rom. in initio.

Prou. 8. v. 8, 9.

words of wisedome to be open and easie to euery one of vnderstanding, that is, which haue a desire to the truth, and are not blinded of the prince of this world. For, as by the foole, he meaneth euery wicked man: so by a man of vnderstanding, he meaneth euery one that is godly. Hereupon it is said, that God reuealeth his secret counsels to all that feare him: That whosoeuer will do the will of God, the same shall know his doctrine: That they which abide in Gods word, shall know the truth: That God reuealeth his will vnto the simple and vnlearned ones, and hideth his secrets from the wise and prudent: That the whole bodie of the scripture, from the head to the foote thereof, is tearmed a lanterne to our feet, and a light vnto our pathes: That Gods word is like a candle, shining in a darke place, vntill the day dawne, and the day-starre arise in our hearts: That the spirituall man doth vnderstand all things which are necessarie for his saluation: for so *Lyra* and *Dionysius Carthusianus*, two great learned Papists, doe expound the place. And consequently, if Gods word be hidden to any, it is hidden to those that perish, to those whose vnderstandings the god of this world hath blinded, that the light of the Gospell of the glorie of Christ, should not shine vnto them.

Psal.25.v.9. *Iohn.7.v.17.* *Iohn.8.v.31, 32.* *Mat.11.v.25* *Psal.119. v.105.* *2.Pet.1.v.19.* *1.Cor.2.v.15.* *2.Cor.4.v.3,4*

Chrys. in 2.Thes. cap.2. hom.3.

S. *Chrysostome* hath these golden words: *Quid opus est concionatore? Per nostrã negligentiam necessitas ista facta est. Quamobrẽ namq; concione opus est? Omnia clara sunt & plana ex diuinis scripturis; quæcunq; necessaria sunt, manifesta sunt.* What neede is there of a preacher? Our negligence hath caused this necessitie. For to what end is a sermon needfull? All things are cleere and euident in the holy scriptures, what things soeuer are necessarie, the same are manifest.

Chry. in Coloss. ho.9.col.1290

The same S. *Chrysostome* in his Commentaries vpon the Epistle to the Colossians, hath these words: *Audite quotquot estis mundani, & vxoribus præ estis ac liberis, quomodo & vobis potissimum precipiat scripturas legere; idq; non simpliciter, neq; obiter, sed magna diligentia. Sequitur Paulo inferius. Audite*

dite obsecro seculares omnes. Comparate vobis biblias, animæ pharmaca. Si nihil aliud vultis, vel nouum testamentum acquirite, Apostolum, Acta, Euangelia, continuos ac sedulos doctores. Si acciderit mœstitia, huc veluti apothecam pharmacorum introspice. Hinc tibi sume solamen mali, siue damnum euenerit, siue mors, siue amissio domesticorum. Imò non introspice solum, sed omnia iterum atq; iterum versa, menteq; illa contine. Hoc demum malorum omnium causa est, quod scripturæ ignorantur. Iterum; doce puerum tuum Psalmos illos canere Philosophiæ plenos. Hearken all ye that are encombred with worldly affaires, and haue charge of wiues and children, how you specially are commanded to read the scriptures, and that not simply nor slenderly, but with great diligence. Heare I pray you, all secular persons. Prouide and furnish your selues with Bibles, the soueraigne medicines of your souls. If you will haue no other thing, at the least prouide the new Testament, the Apostle, the Acts, the Gospell, the continuall and diligent Doctors. If any griefe come, turne thine eye vnto the scripture, as to the Apothecaries shop full of medicines. From hence receiue solace of euill, whether domage, or death, or losse of worldly goods chance vnto thee. Yea, looke not onely to the scripture, but volue and reuolue all things contained therein, and keepe the same in mind. For this is the cause of all manner of euils, that men are ignorant in the holy scriptures. Teach your children to sing Psalmes, which are full of Philosophie.

Thus writeth this holy father, teaching vs at large, how necessarie and needfull a thing it is for euery one to studie and reade diligently the holy scriptures. For first, he telleth vs plainely, that all necessarie points of doctrine are so plaine and manifest, as one may vnderstand the same without the preacher. Secondly, that they who are charged with wiues, children, and worldly affaires, are specially and more than others, commaunded to reade the scriptures: The reason hereof hee yeeldeth in another place; becaufe the more they are encombred with the

cares of the world, the more neede they haue to enioy the helpes of the holy scripture. These are his words: *Quid ais homo? Non est tui negotij scripturas euoluere, quoniam in numeris curis distraheris? Imò iusum magis est, quam illorum. Neq; enim illi perinde scripturarum egent præsidio, atq; vos in mediis negotiorum vndis iactati.* What sayest thou o man? Is it not thy part and dutie to reade the holy scriptures, because thou art encombred with many worldly cares? yea, it is so much more thy charge than it is theirs: For they haue not so great neede of the helpe of the scriptures as you haue, who are tossed in the middest of the waues of worldly troubles. Thirdly, that all secular persons of both sexes must furnish themselues with the holy Bible. Fourthly, that they must not onely reade the scriptures barely and slenderly, but that they must doe the same with great diligence. Fiftly, that the scriptures doe minister comforts for all sorrowes, and soueraigne medicines for all sores. Sixtly, that the ignorance of the scriptures is the cause of all euils. Seuenthly, that parents must teach their children to sing Psalmes, yea, euen those Psalmes which are replenished with Philosophie.

Chrys. tom. 3. de Lazaro, to. 2. col. 1340

S. *Austen* teacheth in the same manner, that all things necessarie for mans saluation, are plaine and easie to be vnderstood. These are his expresse words: *In his enim quæ aperte in scriptura posita sunt, inueniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem moresq; viuendi.* For in those things which are plainely set downe in the holy scripture, are found all things concerning faith and manners.

Aug. de doctr. Chr. li. 2. ca. 9.

The same S. *Austen* in another place hath these words: *Magnifice igitur & salubriter spiritus sanctus ita scripturas sanctas modificauit, vt locis apertioribus fami occurreret, obscurioribus autem fastidia detergeret.* God hath so tempered the holy scriptures, that by manifold places he might prouide against famine, and by those which are more obscure, he might cleanse the loathsomenesse of our stomacks. And his reason hereof followeth in these next words: *Nihil enim fere*

Aug. de doctr. Chr. li. 2. ca. 6.

fere de illis obscuritatibus eruitur, quod nõ planissime dictũ alibi reperiatur. For almost nothing is contained in obscure places, which is not most plainely vttered in some other place.

The same father in an other place hath these wordes; *Net solum vobis sufficiat, quod in ecclesia diuinas lectiones auditis, sed etiam in domibus vestris aut ipsi legite, aut alios legentes requirite, & libenter audite.* Let it not be enough for you, onely to heare Gods word in the Church; but also reade it your selues in your houses, or else procure others to reade it, and heare you them willingly. *Aug. de tempore serm. 55.*

Out of these wordes of this holy writer, and antient father, we may learne many godly lessons. First, that all things needfull for our saluation, are plainely set downe in the scriptures. Secondly, that things which are obscurely touched in some places, are plainely handled in other places. Thirdly, that the scriptures are obscure in some places, to exercise our wits, and to cleanse the loathsomnesse of our stomackes. Fourthly, that we must reade the scriptures at home in our houses, and not heare them read in the Churches. Fiftly, that if we cannot reade them our selues, then must we procure others to reade them to vs, and marke diligently what they reade, and heare them with desire and alacritie of mind.

Saint *Hierome* is consonant to Saint *Austen* and Saint *Chrysostome*, affirming, that in his time (which was about 1200 yeeres agoe) both Monkes, men, and women, did contend who could learne moe scriptures without booke. These are his expresse words; *Solent & viri, solent & monachi; solent & mulierculæ hoc inter se habere certamen, vt plures ediscant scripturas; & in eo se putant esse meliores, si plures edidicerint.* Men, women, and Monkes, vse to contend one with another, who can learne moe scriptures: and herein they thinke themselues better, if they can learne more. *Hieron. in Psal. 133.*

The same Saint *Hierome* in an other place, speaking of the education of a yoong maid of seuen yeeres old, hath

these

Hier. ad Gaudentium, tom. 1. fol. 44 B.

these words: *Matris nutum pro verbis ac monitis, & pro imperio habeat. Amet vt parentem. subiiciatur vt dominæ, timeat vt magistram. Cum autem virgunculam rudem & edentulã septimus ætatis annus exceperit, & cæperit erubescere scire quid taceat, dubitare quid dicat: discat memoriter psalterium, & vsq; ad annos pubertatis libros Salomonis, euangelia, Apostolos, & prophetas, sui cordis thesaurum faciat.* Let her mothers beck to her, be in stead of words, admonitions, and commaunds. Let her loue her as her parent, obey her as her Ladie, and feare her as her mistris. And when the rude and toothlesse girle shall be seuen yeere old, and shall begin to be bashful, to know when to be silent, and when to speake: then let her learne the Psalmes by heart, and without Booke: and till she be twelue yeares of age, or marriageable, let her make the Bookes of Salomon, the Gospels, Apostles, and Prophets, the treasure of her heart. Thus writeth S. *Hierome*: out of whose golden words, I note these golden obseruaon. Firſt, that both men and women in his dayes, did studie and read the scriptures, as diligently and painefully as the monkes. Secondly, that in his time they thought themselues the happiest people, who could con by heart the most texts of holy scripture: Whereas amongst the papists they are deemed most holy, that can by heart no scripture at all, but absteine from the reading thereof, as from the poyson of their soules. Thirdly, that yong women being but seuen yeares of age, must be acquainted with the holy scriptures, & learne by heart the booke of Psalmes. Fourthly, that from seuen yeares vpward vntill pubertie, that is to say, vntill the twelft yeere of their age, they must read seriously the Bookes of *Salomon*, the Gospels, Apostles, and Prophets, and set their whole delight therein.

Hier. ad Celant. tom. 1. fol. 50. A.

And the same holy Father in his Epistle to the godly matrone *Celentia*, doth perswade her for the best course of her life, to bee continually conuersant in the holy scriptures. These are his words: *Sint ergo diuinæ scripturæ semper in manibus tuis, & ingiter mente voluantur.* Let therefore the holy scriptures

scriptures be alwayes in thy hands, and let them be vncessantly tossed or rolled in thy mind.

Saint *Theodoretus* telleth vs with good liking thereof, that in his time the scriptures were translated into all maner of languages, and that they were not only vnderstood of doctors, and masters of the Church, but euen of the lay-people, and common artificers. His expresse wordes I will alledge, which are these; *Hebraici vero libri, non modo in Graecum idioma conuersi sunt, sed in Romanam quoque linguam, Ægyptiam, Persicam, Indicam, Armenicā q̄, & Scythicam, at q̄ adeo Sauromaticam, semelq̄ vt dicam, in linguas omnes, quibus ad hanc diem nationes vtuntur. Sequitur paulò inferius, fossores q̄ adeo ac bubulcos innenias; plantarumq̄ consitores de diuina trinitate, ye umq̄ omnium creatione disertantes.* The Hebrew bookes are turned not onely into the Greeke tongue, but also into the Roman language, also into the Ægyptian, Persian, Indians, Armenian, and Scythian, as also into the Sauromatick tongue, and to speake all in a word, into all tongues, which in this day are in vse amongst nations. And after hee hath told vs that the Church-doctrine, is knowne to all maner artizans of both sexes; he addeth, that we may find ditchers, deluers, neatheards, and gardiners, disputing euen of the blessed Trinitie, and of the creation of all things. Whereupon it is euident, that in the ancient Church, and in the time of old Religion, (as the silly fooliſh papists call their Romish inuentions, which is indeed a newly inuented Religion, as I haue prooued in my Suruey of poperie) euerie Nation had the holy scriptures in their vulgar language: and that in those dayes, all the Christians did read the holy Scriptures so seriously, that both men and women, of all trades and conditions, were able to dispute of the holy trinitie, and of the world. Which two points doubtlesse, are the most difficult, obscure, hard, and intricate articles, in the whole course of Theologie.

Theodor. lib. 5. de Graeca, affect. curat. pa. 521.

The Iesuit *Bellarmine*, (a wonderfull thing to be heard,

and almoſt incredible, ſauing (that the truth muſt needes in time haue the vpper hand) confeſſeth ſo much vnawares, as is able ſufficiently to prooue and conclude my intended ſcope and propoſition. Theſe are his expreſſe words; *His notatis, dico illa omnia ſcripta eſſe ab apoſtolis, qua ſunt omnibus neceſſaria, & qua ipſi palam omnibus vulgo pradicauerant; alia autem non omnia ſcripta eſſe.* Theſe obſeruations being marked, I anſwere, that all thoſe things were written by the Apoſtles, which are neceſſarie for all men, and which the Apoſtles preached openly to all the vulgar people; but that all other things were not written. Thus writeth our skilfull Ieſuit, who in the name of all papiſts, (being as it were their mouth) ſaith all that can be ſaid, in defence of late Romiſh religion. Out of whoſe words I note firſt, that all things neceſſarie for all men and all women, old men, yoong men, maids, and babes, rich and poore, noble and ignoble, are ſet downe and conteined in the holy ſcriptures. Secondly, that all things contained in the written word, are neceſſarie for all people. Thirdly, that thoſe things which are not contained in the written word, were neuer preached openly to all people, but ſecretly to ſome few perſons in ſecret corners; peraduenture to our Ieſuits and Ieſuited popelings, ſauing that their ſect was not then hatched, as which is not yet eighty yeeres old. Fourthly, that thoſe things which are not contained in the ſcriptures and written word, are not neceſſarie for all people, but onely for Ieſuits and papiſts, to bring them to perdition. Fiftly, that ſeeing on the one ſide, all things needfull for all men and all women, for yong and old, rich and poore, noble and ignoble, are contained in the ſcriptures. And ſeeing withall on the other ſide, that all things in the written word are neceſſarie for all people, (marke well what I ſay, gentle reader, for I build my worke vpon that foundation which the Ieſuit hath laid) it followeth by neceſſarie conſequution, that all people ought ſeriouſly to reade the holy ſcripture: as alſo

Bellar. tom. 1. col. 191. lib. 4. de verbo Dei ſcripto, cap. 11. a.

also that they may safely contemne all vnwritten traditions, as nothing needefull or pertaining to them. But let vs heare our Cardinall Iesuit once againe speake for himselfe, and for the honour of this holy father the Pope. These are his expresse words: *At in nouo testamento, quia Christus impleuit figuras & prophetias; etsi multi non intelligant sententias scripturarum, intelligunt tamen ipsa mysteria redemptionis, etiam rustici & mulieres.* But in the new testament, because Christ hath fulfilled the figures and the prophesies; although many doe not vnderstand the sentences of the scriptures, yet doe they vnderstand the mysteries of our redemption, euen the common countrey fellowes and the very women. *Bellar. de verbo dei, lib. 3. cap. 2. tom. 1. col. 129.*

Thus writeth our Iesuit, affirming, that euen women and the very rustickes of the countrey, doe vnderstand the scriptures, so farre forth as pertaineth to the mysteries of their redemption: and I pray you, why then doth the Pope debarre them from the reading thereof? VVhat more knowledge is needefull ouer and besides the mysteries of mans redemption? It is all the knowledge which Saint *Paule* desired to haue: who (as he saith of himselfe) esteemed not to know any thing among them, saue Iesus Christ, and him crucified. I therefore conclude by our Iesuits owne free graunt, that it behoooueth all men and women, children and maids, diligently to reade the holy scriptures, seeing they may vnderstand therein all the mysteries of their redemption, *viz.* all knowledge necessarie for their saluation. VVhich knowledge is so necessarie, as nothing can be more. Ye (saith God by the mouth of his seruant *Moses*) shall lay vp these my words in your heart and in your soule, and binde them for a signe vpon your hand, that they may be as a frontlet betweene your eyes. And ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest downe, and when thou risest vp. And thou shalt write them vpon the posts of thine house, and *1. Cor. 2. v. 2.* *Deu. 11. v. 18, 19, 20.* *Deu. 6. v. 8, 9.* *Deut. 4. v. 9.*

and vpon thy gates. But our Papists obiect against vs, that when the fathers exhort all men and women to reade the scriptures, they speake as pulpit-men agreeably to their audience, and the peoples default; but not as teachers in the schoole, making exact and generall rules to be obserued in all places and times. To which I answere first, that the truth must be spoken as well in the pulpit, as in the schoole. Secondly, that the doctrine in pulpit is and ought to be as exact, absolute, and necessarie, as the doctrine in schoole: The sole and onely difference is or ought to be thus, *viz.* that the pulpit hath euer the pricke of exhortation annexed, which the schoole wanteth. For the preacher may not speake at randon in the pulpit, but euen there must hee haue the girdle of truth about his loynes. Thirdly, that holy *Dauid* regarded no such popish distinction, when asking, whereby a yong man shall clense his waies? he answereth thus: By studie, meditation, and keeping of the law of God. Neither the godly men in Berhæa, when they daily searched the scriptures, euen to examine the doctrine of the Apostles by them. Our papists obiect likewise, that S. *Paule* will haue women to liue in silence, and not to chat and prattle of the Scriptures. I answere, that though S. *Paule* will not permit women to teach publickely before men; yet doth he neither forbid them to read the scriptures, nor yet to teach priuately, when due circumstances doe occurre. For the same Apostle elsewhere commaundeth mothers to teach godly thinges to their children. So *Salomon*, the wisest child that euer was among the sonnes of *Adam*, one Christ euer excepted, confesseth plainely and humbly, what doctrine his mother *Bethsheba* taught him. So *Priscilla*, wife to *Aquila* the Iew borne in Pontus, expounded the scriptures to the Iew *Apollo*, borne at Alexandria, a verie eloquent man. So *Timothie* was throughly instructed in the scriptures by his mother *Eunice*, and by his grandmother *Lois*. By which notable example it is euident and cleere to euerie one, that neither

Rhemes testament in præfatio, sect. 1.

Psal. 119. *v.* 9.

Act. 17. *v.* 11.

1. *Tim.* 2. *v.* 12

Tit. 2. *v.* 3.

Prou. 31. *v.* 1.

Act. 18. *v.* 26.

2. *Ti.* 1. *v.* 5. & 3. *Ti.* 3. *v.* 15.

neither mothers must forbeare to teach, nor yet young babes forbeare to learne the holy scriptures.

The third Proposition.

Traditions must bee examined by the holy scriptures, which is the true touchstone of veritie; and then onely admitted, when they are found to be consonant to the same. For proofe of this proposition, the verie name or word (Canonicall) is of it selfe-sufficient. For (Canon) is a Greek word, which signifieth a rule, and thereupon those bookes are called the Canonicall scriptures, which are the rule of our faith. And consequently, whatsoeuer is not consonant to the scriptures, the same ought to bee reiected, as pernitious and swaruing from the rule of our faith. For this cause doth the *Prophet Esay* send vs to the law, and to the testimonie, there to trie the truth. *Esa.8.v.20.* For this cause doth the *Prophet Malachie* exhort the people euer to bee mindfull of the law of *Moses*. *Mal.4.4.* For this cause doth the prophet *Dauid* tell vs, That Gods word is a lanterne to our feet. *Ps.119.v.105* For this cause saith S. *Peter*, That Gods word is a light shining in darke places, vntill the day-starre arise in our hearts. *2.Pet.1.v.19.* For this cause did Christ himselfe exhort the Iewes to read seriously the holy scriptures. *Iob.5.v.39.* For this cause sayd Christ, That the *Pharisies* erred, because they knew not the scriptures. *Mat.22.v.29* For this cause did the men at Berhæa trie the truth of S. *Paules* doctrine by the scriptures. *Act.17.v.11.* For this cause doth S. *Iohn* exhort vs not to beleeue euerie spirite, but to trie the spirits, if they bee of God. *1.Iohn 4.v.1.* For this cause doth *Saint Paul* pronounce him accursed that preacheth any doctrine not contained in the *Scriptures*. *Gal.1.2.* For both *S. Austen* and *S. Basill* doe expound that place of the written word. *Aug. cont. literas Pet. lib.3. cap.6. tom.7.* And the truth thereof is alreadie prooued, because the Apostles taught no needfull doctrine, which they did not after commit to writing.

S. *Cyprian* would not yeeld to *Stephanus* then Bishop of Rome, in the controuersie concerning rebaptization; but

Cyprian epist. ad Pomp. 74.

sharpely reproued him for leaning to tradition, and demaunded of him, by what scripture he could proue his tradition. For, in his dayes it was not ynough to alleadge tradition for the proofe of any doctrine. And much lesse was it a rule in Saint *Cyprians* time to follow the bishop of Romes definitiue sentence, in matters of faith and doctrine. Though out sottish and blind papists in these latter dayes doe admit and reuerence his sentence, euen as the holy Gospell. See S. *Cyprians* words in the first proposition.

When the Arrians would not admit the word (ὁμοούσιον) because it was not found in the scriptures, the fathers of the counsell did not then alleadge traditions for proofe thereof; neither did they say, that many things must be beleeued which are not written: but they answered simply, That though that word were not expressely written, yet was it virtually and effectually contained in the scriptures. This assertion is euident by the testimonie of Saint *Athanasius*, whose words are these: *Sed tamen cognoscat quisquis est studiosioris animi, has voces tametsi in scripturis non reperiantur, habere tamen eas eam sententiam quam scriptura volunt.* Although the expresse words be not found in the scripture, yet haue they that meaning and sence which the scripture approoueth and intendeth, as euery one that studieth the scripture seriously, may easily vnderstand.

Athanas. de decret. ni. synod. tom. 2. prope finem.

Origen giueth counsell to trie all doctrines by the scriptures, euen as pure gold is tried by the touchstone. His words are set downe at large in my booke of Motiues, and they are well worth the reading.

Origen in Mat. hom. 25. & hom. 1. in 1. cap. Ier.

Tertullian hath these words: *Id esse verum, quodcunq; primum; id esse adulterum, quodcunq; posterius.* We must know, that that is the truth, whatsoeuer was first; and that that is counterfet, whatsoeuer commeth after the first.

Tertull. aduers. praxe. in principe.

S. *Austen* hath many golden sentences and worthie testimonies to this end and purpose. One only I will here recount, where he hath these words: *Nemo mihi dicat, ô quid dixit Donatus, aut quid dixit Parmenianus, aut Pontius, aut quilibet*

Aug. de vint. eccles. cap. 10. non longe ab initio, tom. 7.

quilibet illorum: quia nec Catholicis episcopis consentiendum est, sicubi forte falluntur, vt contra canonicas dei scripturas aliquid sentiant. Let no man say to me, oh what said *Donatus*, or what said *Parmenianus*, or *Pontius*, or any of them; because we must not consent euen to Catholicke bishops, if it so fall out, that they erre in any point, and speake against the canonicall scriptures.

Saint *Chrysostome*, surnamed the golden mouthed doctor, agreeth vniformely vnto the other fathers in many places of his workes. One onely period shall for the present suffice, where he hath these golden words; *Quomodo autem non absurdum est propter pecunias alijs non credere, sed ipsas numerare & supputare, pro rebus autem ampheribus, aliorum sententiam sequi simpliciter; presertim, cum habeamus omnium exactissimam trutinam, & gnomonem, ac regulam, diuinarum inquam legum assertionem. Ideo obsecro & oro omnes vos, vt relinquatis quidnam huic vel illi videatur, deq; his a scripturis hac etiam inquirite, & veras diuitias discentes eas sectemur, vt & aeterna bona assequamur.* How can it but be absurd, that in money matters we will not credit others, but will tell the money our selues; and for all that in affaires of greater importance, (which concerne the health and saluation of our soules) we can be content simply to follow the iudgement and opinion of others; especially, when we haue the most exact ballance, squire and rule of all things, I meane the plaine testimonie of Gods lawes. I therefore pray and beseech you all, that you will reiect what this man or that man thinketh, and search the truth out of the scriptures; that learning true riches, we may follow them, and so attaine eternall life. Behold here (gentle reader) a most excellent and christian exhortation, a very godly and golden aduise, giuē vs by this holy father. If we will not (saith he) trust others to tell our money, but for sureneſſe will tell it our selues; much lesse should we trust others, and much lesse depend vpon their iudgements and sayings, in matters touching our saluation: but our selues

Chry. in 1. Cor. 7. hom. 13. in fine.

must

muſt learne and know ſuch things, by diligent reading of the holy ſcriptures. Neither muſt we beleeue what this or that man ſaith, but what we finde to be true, by painefull ſtudie of the boly ſcriptures. Now let vs heare attentiuely, what the beſt approoued papiſts teach vs, concerning this important and moſt weightie controuerſie.

Victor. de aug. charit. relect. 8 p. 308.

Franciſcus à victoria, a learned ſchoole-man and Spaniſh popiſh Frier, yeelds his opinion in theſe expreſſe wordes: *Propter quas (opiniones) nullo modo debemus diſcedere, à regula & ſynceritate ſcripturarum.* For which opinions wee may in no wiſe depart from the rule and ſyncerilie of the ſcriptures.

Victor. de ſacra. pa. 120.

Againe, in another place he hath theſe wordes: *Non eſt mihi certum, licet in hoc conueniant omnes, quia in ſcriptura non habetur.* I doe not thinke it ſure and certaine, although all writers agree thereunto, becauſe it is not to be found in the holy ſcriptures.

Canus de locis, lib. 3. cap. vlt.

Melchior Canus, another learned ſchoole-doctor and renowned popiſh Biſhop, confirmeth the ſame doctrine in theſe words: *Fatemur non audiendos eſſe ſacerdotes, niſi docuerint iuxta legem domini.* Wee graunt, that wee muſt not giue eare or hearken to the prieſts, except they ſhall teach vs according to Gods law.

Loe, the Papiſts affirme plainely, that no doctrine is ſound, or to be receiued, but that onely which is tryed to be true by Gods word. Neither may wee beleeue the Doctrine of any popiſh prieſt, vnleſſe it be agreeable to Gods law. Now doubtleſſe, if the Pope will be tryed and iudged by this doctrine, which his beſt Doctors haue publiſhed to the world (the ſpirit of God hauing enforced them thereunto) we ſhall ſoone agree in all controuerſies of religion. And certes, this their Doctrine is ſo certaine and euident, that the Ieſuit *Bellarmine* ſingeth the ſame ſong with them; which my ſelfe could not eaſily haue beleeued, if I had not read his owne teſtimonie in his owne Booke. Theſe are his expreſſe wordes: *Siue dubio ſinguli epiſcopi errare poſſunt,*

Bellar. de conc. lib. 2. ca. 2. in fine.

possunt, & aliquando errant, & inter se quandoq́; dissentiunt, vt nesciamus quisnam eorũ sequendus sit. It is without all doubt, that all Bishops seuerally may erre, and sometime doe erre, and doe so disagree among themselues, that we cannot in the world tell which of them we may safely follow. Thus you see euen by the Iesuits verdict, that in the popish Church, all their Bishops doe so erre, and sometimes so dissent one from another, that no Papist can tell indeed which of them it is best to follow. To which doctrine I will very willingly subscribe, aduising this Iesuit and all other Iesuited papists to remember well this doctrine, and not to hang their soules henceforth vpon their iarring and doting popish fathers; whom (as their deere Iesuit and renowmed Cardinall *Bellarmine* telleth them) they may not safely follow. And least the Iesuit or some for him shall answere me or say in his defence, That albeit all popish Bishops may erre seuerally, and dissent among themselues, as is alreadie said; yet can they not erre, when they are called together in a Synode or Counsell, and the same confirmed by the Pope. This is all doubtlesse that possibly can be said in defence of popish doctrine: And consequently, if I shall once prooue this to be a rotten foundation, then must all popish buildings raised vpon the same, fall downe, and be euen with the ground. Marke (gentle Reader) my syncere replie, which I shall pithyly and plainely set downe in this behalfe. Wherein for perspicuitie sake, I will proceede by way of conclusions.

The first Conclusion.

The Pope was neuer present at the Counsels in the East Churches, by himselfe and in his owne person. This conclusion is freely confessed by the Iesuit *Bellarmine*, who alleadgeth two reasons for the Popes absence: The one forsooth, because it was not conuenient, that the head should follow the members: The other, because the Emperour would euer sit in the highest place. Out of whose *Bellar. de cont. lib. 1. cap. 19.*

words, I must needes note two important points by the way: The one, that in the auntient Church the highest place in the counsels, was euer reserued to the Emperour: The other, that the East Churches did neuer acknowledge the Popes primacie, which he this day arrogantly challengeth ouer all kingdomes and regalities. To which twaine, this pleasant adiunct perforce must be annexed, *viz.* that our humble father the Pope (who calleth himselfe hypocritically *seruus seruorum dei*) would neuer come to the Counsels, because forsooth he could not endure to see the Emperour sitting in the highest place.

The second Conclusion.

The Pope staying at home himselfe, sendeth his legates to the counsels, to supplie his place, to whom for all that he cannot commit his authoritie. This conclusion must needs seeme strange to a great many; but I will confirme it with the testimonie of such a worthie and renowmed papist, that all whosoeuer shall once heare or reade it, cannot but giue credit to the same.

Melchior Canus is the man, from whose pen I receiued it; the case is euident, these are his words: *Decreta quæ à legato contra sedis Apostolicæ traditionem approbantur, non habent Romanæ ecclesiæ authoritatem; nec aliter se habent, quam si à concilio sine legatis prodijssent. Sequitur; solidam auctoritatem quam in confirmãdis & fratribus & dogmatibus Petrus habet, in legatos transferre non potest.* The decrees which the legate shall approoue against the tradition of the Church of Rome, haue no authoritie from the Church of Rome; neither are they of any more force, than if they had proceeded from the counsell without the consent of the legates. The found authoritie which *Peter* hath in confirming his brethren and decrees, he cannot transferre vnto his legates. These are the expresse words of *Canus*, that worthie bishop, and strong pillar of popish doctrine. Out of whose words I note first, that decrees of counsels be of

Canus lib. 5. de authorit. conc. cap. 5. pa. 102.

no

no force, when they shaue not the consent of the Popes Legates. Secondly, that the decrees of counsels, euen when they haue the consent of the Legates, are of no force at all, if the Legates shall agree to any thing which is against the Popes minde. Thirdly, that the *Pope* cannot translate or giue his authoritie vnto the Legates. And consequently, that the *Pope* abuseth the whole world shamefully, when he calleth together all *Bishops* in the Christian world, to decide and determine controuersies in Religion: and for all that, will approoue nothing that they doe or decree, vnlesse it be agreeable to that which himselfe decreeth apart in his chaire at home.

The third conclusion.

Generall popish counsels in these our daies are euen as a nose of waxe: and the decrees thereof are as vncertaine as the wind. I prooue this conclusion by verie strong and irrefragable reasons. The Iesuit *Bellarmine* hath these words: *Nos dicimus, concessum episcoporum in conciliis legitimis esse verum iudicum concessum: & eorum decreta & leges, necessario sequendas.* We say, that the consistorie of Bishops in lawfull counsels, is the true assembly of iudges: and that their decrees and lawes must be obserued of necessitie. *Bellar. de conc. li. 1. c. 18. to. 1.*

But in another place the same *Bellarmine* singeth another song in these expresse words: *Idem enim est, siue pontifex expresse concilium reprobet, siue concilium agat contra pontificis sententiam.* For it is all one, whether the *Pope* disanull the counsell expresly, or the counsell doe against the *Popes* mind. *Bellar. de conc. li. 2. cap. 11.*

Againe, the same *Bellarmine* in another place auoucheth, that the greater part of voices must beare the sway in counsels. These are his owne words: *Non potest fieri, vt aliquando ad finem controuersiarum deueniatur, nisi detur locus maiori parti suffragiorum.* It cannot be, that there should euer bee made an end of controuersies, except the greater part of voices may haue the vpper hand. *Bellar. de conc. lib. 1. cap. 21.*

Bellar. de conc. lib. 2. cap. 11.

Againe in another place, he hath theſe words; *Eſt autem verum decretum concilij, quod ſit à maiori parte; alioqui nullum eſſet legitimum concilij decretum, cum ſemper aliqui diſſentiãt.* It is the true decree of the councell, which hath the conſent of the greater part: for otherwiſe there ſhould be no lawfull decree made at all, ſeeing ſome doe euermore diſſent.

Canus de locis lib 5. cap. 5. pag. 164.

This notwithſtanding, their famous biſhop *Melchior Canus*, doth roundly tell vs another tale. Theſe are his expreſſe words. *Non itaq; quod in humanis conceſſionibus fit, plurimum apud nos ſententia præualet; & paulo poſt; non enim numero hæc iudicantur, ſed pondere: pondus autem conciliis dat ſummi pontificis, & grauita, & authoritas. Quæ ſi adſit, centum patres ſatis ſunt, ſin deſit, nulli ſint ſatis, ſint quamlibet plurimi.* It is not therefore with vs, as it is in humane aſſemblies, where moe voyces euer doe preuaile. For theſe matters are not to be iudged by number, but by weight. And the Councels receiue their weight, from the grauitie and authoritie of the Pope. Thus writeth our popiſh biſhop *Canus*. Now who ſeeth not, that the decrees of popiſh councels, are as vncertaine as the wind? For the Ieſuit telleth vs, that moe voyces muſt needes preuaile. But *Melchior* their renowmed biſhop, is of another minde: that be they many, be they few, what part ſoeuer the Pope liketh, that ſame ſhall be true. For after the fathers haue faſted long, prayed much, conſulted grauely, deliberated maturely, decreed ſoberly, commanded ſtrictly, and accurſed ſeuerely; neither others, nor yet themſelues can tell, what ſhall be of force therein. For all muſt be as ſhall beſt content the Popes humour, ſitting right ſtately in his chaire at Rome.

The fourth Concluſion.

No biſhop can in theſe our dayes haue voices in Councels, but ſuch as will firſt ſweare obedience to the Pope, and promiſe to defend his cannon law. This concluſion though it containe groſſe abſurdities, yet is it ſo cleare, as

Bellarmine

Bellarmine that Iesuitical Cardinall cannot denie the same. These be his words. *Illud iuramentum non tollit episcoporum libertatem, quæ in concilijs necessaria est. Iurant enim se fore obedientes summo pontifici, quod intelligitur donec pontifex est, & dum iubet ea quæ secundum Deum & sacros canones iubere potest: sed non iurant se non dicturos quod sentiunt in concilio, vel se non deposituros eum, si hæreticum esse comuincant.* This oath taketh not away the libertie of bishops, which in councels is necessarie. For they sweare that they will be obedient to the Pope; which is to be vnderstood, so long as he is Pope, and while he commaundeth those things, which he may commaund agreeable to God, and to the holy cannons; but they sweare not, that they will not speake what they thinke in the councell, or that they will not depose the Pope if they proue him to be an heretique. *Bellar. de conc. lib. 1. cap. vlt.*

Thus writeth *Bellarminus*, whose onely testimonie is most sufficient in all popish affaires: as who is the Popes sworne and tenderly beloued vassall, and whose bookes are dedicated to the Pope himselfe. Out of his wordes I note first, that all clergie men admitted to giue voyces in councels, are sworne simply wholy to obey the Popes constitutions.

Secondly, that the said persons are sworne to beleeue, that the Pope cannot erre in his iudiciall decrees of faith and manners; that no councels are of force, without the Popes confirmation; that councels confirmed by him, are approued by the holy Ghost; that he can excommunicate and depose, all Emperours, and Empresses, all Kings and Queenes, all Bishops and Archbishops in the Christian world; that he can by his pardons deliuer all soules out of purgatorie, and goe himselfe to the deuill. For all these and a thousand like things, are strictly comprised in his canons, and consequently in their most lamentable oath.

Thirdly, that they are sworne to admit his decrees, who (as they freely grant) may for all that be an heretique.

Fourthly, that they are sworne to reuerence and obey his iudgement in all matters of faith, whom they may iudge and depose for heresie.

Fiftly, that their fundamentall article, by which they make the Pope iudge ouer all controuersies; is quite ouerthrowne, and turned vpside downe, in this *Bellarminus* his explication. For when he saith (While he commaundeth &c.) hee graunteth euerie Bishop freedome to examine and iudge, when the Pope commaundeth thinges agreeable to God and the canons. Which libertie, if the Papists would constantly performe, all true Christians and perfect Catholikes, would soone agree with them. For none that beleeue aright, wilt denie obedience to the Pope, when hee preacheth, teacheth, or commaundeth any thing which is agreeable to God and holy canons. But good Christians finding his Canons to be disholy, and his dectees to be against God; doe thinke as *Bellarmine* here teacheth them, that they are not bound to obey him. And that the reader may fully vnderstand the abhomination of the oath which all popish Bishops sweare vnto the Pope; I will here set downe the expresse words, as I finde them *verbatim* in the Popes owne decretals; *Ego N. episcopus, ab hac hora fidelis ero S.* Petro, *sanctæ & Romanæ ecclesiæ, dominoq; meo papæ N. eiusq; successoribus canonicè intrantibus. Sequitur; papatum Romanæ ecclesiæ, & regulas sanctorum patrum adiutor ero, ad defendendum & retinendum contra omnes homines; sic me Deus adiuuet, & hæc sancta euangelia.* I (*Iohn Watson*) Bishop, wil be faithfull from this day forward, to S. *Peter* and to the holy Church of Rome, and to my L. (*Boniface*) the Pope, and to his successors elected canonically; and I will be an helper to keepe and defend against all people, the Popedome or papall soueraignte, and the rules of the holy fathers; so God me helpe, and the holy Gospell.

Decret. lib. 1. tit. 24. cap. 4.

Loe here (gentle reader,) open and flat rebellion is required, and by euangelicall oath confirmed, of subiects against their soueraignes. For, the Bishops of euerie countrie,

trie, are the subiects of the kings of the same countreys; and yet doe they sweare to defend the Popes vsurped iurisdiction, and most bloodie tyrannie, against their naturall dread soueraignes. For they sweare to defend the Popes vsurped authoritie, against all people, without exception. Which his diabolicall vsurped primacy, (as I haue prooued at large elsewhere) extendeth it selfe to the translation of empires, kingdomes, and regalities.

These conclusions being well marked and remembred, the answere to the mightie obiection, which is as the foundation of poperie, will be plaine and easie, *viz.* that popish bishops may as well erre, when they are assembled together in a generall councell, as when they preach, teach, or write asunder. For first, the Pope himselfe will not shew his face in any councell, because the emperour must sit aboue him, as is euident by the first conclusion. Secondly, when the Pope sendeth his legates to councels to supplie his place, he doth but delude the world by that fact; seeing he cannot impart his authoritie vnto them, as by the second conclusion is apparant. Thirdly, popish councels and synodes in these after ages, are flexible as a nose of waxe, and as vncertaine as the weathercocke, as is clearely prooued in the third conclusion. Fourthly, no bishops of late ages can haue voyces in popish councels, but such as will first sweare obedience to the Pope, and promise by oath to defend his vsurped power, and most execrable canon law, as by the fourth conclusion will appeare. Fiftly, that decree is true and iust, which is concluded by the greater part of the bishops there assembled; and yet the Pope sitting at Rome in his chaire, will reiect such decrees at his good pleasure, and define the sentence of fewer voyces to be of force. This obseruation is euidently confirmed, by the due proofes of the third conclusion. Sixtly, the decrees of councels must needs be obeyed, as the papists tell vs; and yet the Pope may reiect them, and disanull them at his pleasure, euen

dreaming

dreaming in his chaire at home, or riding abroad on his white palfrey. This to be so is euidēt to euery one, that shal seriously peruse the third conclusion. Yea, our papists of Rhemes in their commentary vpon the new testament, tell vs plainely and roundly; that the determination of councels is needelesse, because the Popes iudgement alone is infallible. Wherefore they ad this clause to salue the Popes proceedings, That councels are called not for necessitie sake, but for the better contentation of the weake. I therefore conclude against the popish supposed bulwarke, that seeing all Bishops may erre seuerally, as the Iesuit *Bellarmine* hath taught vs; and seeing also that the constitutions in popish councels are nothing else indeede, but the bare decrees of one onely bishop, as is alreadie prooued; it followeth of necessitie, and cannot be denied, that all bishops in the popish Church may erre egregiously; and that as well iointly as seuerally, as is to be seene at large in my Golden ballance of triall: to which treatise I referre the reader for better satisfaction, both touching the Popes double person, and concerning his priuate and publike errors, In the *interim*, I must needes tell the Papists; that a generall Councell is aboue the Pope; that a generall Councell hath power to depose the Pope; that a generall Councell did *de facto* depose *Iohn* the 12 long sithence, and *Iohn* the 13 of that name; as I haue prooued at large by sound popish testimonie, in my Anatomie of popish tyrannie. And thus haue I prooued, that the sole and onely scripture inspired from heauen, is the infallible rule of truth; and that all traditions must be examined by the same, and then admitted when they be consonant thereunto, not otherwise: howsoeuer antiquitie be pretended in that behalfe.

Rhemes test. act. 15.

The fourth Proposition.

Ratio. prima. Popish vnwritten traditions are so vncertaine and doubtfull, that the best learned papists are at great contention

tention about them, and cannot possibly bee accorded therein. For the proofe of this proposition, it were ynough to call to mind that great and endlesse strife, which was in the Church about 1400. yeeres sithence, betweene *Victor* then Bishop of Rome and the Bishops of Asia. The controuersie was among them, concerning the keeping of Easter. Tradition apostolicall was alleadged earnestly, and both sides did stoutly defend the same.

The same tradition was in controuersie afore *Polycarpus* the Bishop of Smyrna, and *Anicetus* the Bishop of Rome. But neither could *Polycarpe* perswade *Anicetus*, nor *Anicetus* perswade *Polycarpus*; albeit they both agreed as deere friends. The storie is set downe at large, by *Eusebius* a learned Father and most famous Historiographer. But *Victor* the Bishop of Rome dealt so furiously in that controuersie, that *Irenæus* and other bishops of Gallia, did sharpely reprooue him for the same. What neede more bee sayd for the varietie and vncertaintie of traditions? For first, the bishops that thought and taught thus diuersly of traditions, did all of them liue within 200. yeares after Christ; at which time the Church was in good estate, and stayned with verie few or no corruptions at all. Secondly, the one side doubtlesse, must needs be seduced with false and vnsound traditions: For apostolicall doctrine was vniforme and constant, and could not possibly bee contrarie to it selfe. Thirdly, Saint *Policarpe*, *Polycrates*, and the other bishops, did in those dayes make no more reckoning of the bishop of Romes opinion, than they did of another mans. Fourthly, they all were so farre from acknowledging the bishop of Rome, to bee the supreame head of the Church, and that hee could not erre; that they all with vniforme assent affirmed him to defend a grosse errour, and to hold a false opinion; that they all reputed themselues his equals, touching gouernement ecclesiasticall: that they all verie sharpely reprooued him, and with might and maine withstoode his proceedings. Whereas this

Euse. li. 5. hist. cap. 23 & ca. 24. per totum.

this day, if any bishops, magistrates, or other potentates in the world, (where poperie beareth the sway) should doe the like; they might all roundly be excommunicated, and not onely deposed from their iurisdiction, but also be burnt with fire and faggot for their paines. Fiftly, if Saint *Polycarpe* had cause in his time, being the flourishing age of the Church, to doubt of Romish traditions; much more doubtlesse haue wee cause, at this day to stand in doubt thereof; in these doolefull dayes I say, in which iniquitie hath gotten the vpper hand; In which the Bishops of Rome haue brought a huge multitude of errours into the Church, and seduced a great part of the Christian world.

Ratio secunda. Chrysost. hom. 47. in mat. col. 405.

Another controuersie touching traditions, is for and about the keeping of Lent. For albeit Saint *Chrysostome* tel vs plainely, that Christ did not commaund vs to imitate his fast, but to learne of him to be humble and meeke in heart; yet doe the Papists this day *mordicus* defend it, to be an apostolicall tradition; yea, many of them are so blinded and besotted with vnsauorie traditions, and superstitious illusions, that they deeme it a greater sinne to eate flesh in Lent, than to commit adulterie, murder, or periury.

Euseb. lib. 5. hist. cap. 24.

Of this vnwritten tradition, falsly supposed apostollicall, *Eusebius Cæsarienſis*, a famous Historiographer of great antiquitie, writeth in this manner. *Non solum de die paschæ agitur controuersia, sed & de ipsa specie ieiunij. Quidam existimant vno tantum die obseruari debere ieiunium; alij, duobus; alij vero, pluribus; nonnulli etiam, quadraginta. Quæ varietas obseruantiæ non nunc primum, neq; nostris temporibus cœpit, sed multò ante nos: ex illis vt opinor, qui non simpliciter quod ab initio traditum est, tenentes, in alium morem, vel per negligentiam, vel per imperitiam, postmodum decidêre.* The controuersie is not onely touching the day of Easter, but also concerning the verie kind or manner of fasting. For some thinke, they must onely fast one day, some two dayes, others moe dayes; and there bee that thinke, they should fast Fortie. Which varietie of fasting

fasting did not now begin first, neither yet in our daies, but long before our time; I thinke by them, who keeping not simply what they receiued from the beginning, did afterward fall to another manner, either of negligence, or els of ignorance.

Socrates in like manner reporteth hystorically, that they differed no lesse in their manner of eating, than they did in their daies of abstaining. For some (saith he) would eate no liuing thing; othersome of liuing things, eate onely fish; some together with fish, did eate also birds; but some eate only bread, and others at night eate all kind of meates without difference. Yea, he telleth vs in the same place, that the Romans fast three weekes before Easter, besides the Sabboth and the Lords day. And that the Illyrians and Alexandrians do fast six weekes, and yet do they all tearme their fasts Lent. By which testimonies euery man may easily perceiue, how doubtfull and vncertaine vnwritten traditions be. *Histor. tripar. lib. 9. cap. 38.*

Thirdly, there was another endlesse controuersie concerning traditions, betweene the Greeks and the Latins; whether the Eucharist ought to be celebrated in leauened or in vnleauened bread. *Ratio tertia.*

Fourthly, *Irenaus* a very auntient father, affirmeth out of Apostolicall tradition; that Christ was fortie yeeres old, when he suffered his bitter passion. *Papias* another father, saith vpon the like tradition, that Christ should raign 1000 yeeres after the generall resurrection. *Basilius* another holy father saith, that *Zacharias* the sonne of *Barachias*, slaine betweene the altar and the temple, was father to S. *Iohn* the baptist. These absurdities the papists are this day ashamed to hold; and yet did these fathers receiue them by Apostolicall so supposed tradition, as their owne famous doctor *Andradius* graunteth willingly. *Ratio quarta.* *Irenæ. lib. 2. cap. 39.* *Eusth. lib. 3. cap. vlt.* *Andrad. de trad. lib. 2. pag. 126.*

Fiftly, popish tradition telleth vs, that all the bishops of Rome one after another, haue taught successiuely the selfesame doctrine with S. *Peter*. Howbeit their own deere *Ratio quinta.*

doctor and religious frier *Nicholaus de Lyra*, auoucheth plainely, roundly, and boldly, to the whole world, that many bishops of Rome haue fallen away from the faith, and become flat Apostataes. And least this my narration be thought strange vnto many, that our holy fathers the Popes should be Atheists or Apostataes, and that their owne deare brethren, in high esteeme among them, would neuer so write of them; I will deale plainely in this important point, and after my wonted manner set downe his owne expresse words. Thus doth he write: *Ex quo patet, quod ecclesia non consistit in hominibus ratione potestatis vel dignitatis, ecclesiasticæ vel secularis; quia multi principes, & summi pontifices, & alij inferiores, inuenti sunt à fide apostatasse. Propter quod ecclesia consistit in illis personis, in quibus est notitia vera, & confessio fidei & veritatis.* Whereby it is euident, that the Church doth not consist in men by reason of power or dignitie, either ecclesiasticall or secular; because many princes and Popes, and others of the inferiour sort, are found to haue beene apostataes, and to haue swarued wholie from faith. For which cause, the Church consisteth in those persons, in whom, there is true knowledge, and confession of the faith and of the truth.

Lyranus in cap. 16. mat.

Thus writeth this learned papist (whom their owne so supposed martyr sir *Thomas Moore* called a great clearke, as he was indeede) whose words are well worthie to be engrauen in marble with golden letters. For by his iudgement it is cleare and euident, that not they who sit in S. *Peters* chaire, are euer the true and lawfull successors of S. *Peter*, but they only and solely that confesse and preach S. *Peters* faith and doctrine: as also that their receiued maxime (*vbi Papa, ibi Roma; vbi Roma, ibi ecclesia catholica*) is false, vaine, and friuolous. We therefore this day impugne nothing in popish proceedings, but the selfesame indeed, which famous popish doctors reproued afore our time, and that in their publicke writings published freely to the whole world. Which thing, whosoeuer will seriously

ously ponder as my selfe haue done, that man must perforce, detest, and abhorre all popish superstitious trumperie. But of this argument I haue discoursed at large in my booke of Motiues.

Sixtly, popish tradition telleth vs, that the blessed virgine *Marie*, the true mother of true God and true man, was conceiued without originall sinne, and that the bishop of Rome did for that end ordaine a feastiuall day of her conception, to be kept vpon the eight of December. But by your leaue, *Aquinas* their owne Angelicall Doctor affirmeth resolutely, that she was conceiued in originall sinne. Yea, their other holy doctor and deare frier *Bernard* doth very sharpely reprooue the Cathedrall Church of Lyons, because they obserued the feastiuitie of the conception of the blessed virgine; and he calleth that their practise, the noueltie of presumption, the mother of temeritie, the sister of superstition, and the daughter of leuitie. That done, he addeth these words: *Hoc non est virginem honorare, sed honori detrahere.* This is not to giue honour to the virgine, but to take honour from her. Yet Pope *Sixtus* the fourth did institute the feast of the conception.

Ratio sexta.

Aquinas p. 3. q. 14. art. 3 ad primum.

Bernard. epist. 174. pa. 207.

A.D. 1475.

Seuenthly, popish tradition telleth vs, that the Emperour *Constantine*, worthily surnamed the Great, was baptised at Rome in a font, there remaining to this day, my selfe haue seene the same. Howbeit, *Hieronymus*, *Eusebius*, *Socrates*, *Theodoretus*, *Sozomenus*, *Cassiodorus*, & *Pomponius*, do all affirme very constantly, that he was baptised at Nichomedia.

Ratio septima.

Eightly, popish tradition hath brought flat idolatrie into the Church, teaching to adore them as Saints and Gods friends, who were knowne heretickes, and professed enemies to God and his Church. This to be so, their owne deare friend and brother *Platina* will tell them, when he affirmeth the dead corps of *Hermannus* to haue been worshipped for a saints reliques at Ferrara, the space of twentie yeares together; who for all that was an hereticke, as the same *Platina* auoucheth. VVhere two speciall things

Ratio octaua.

Platina in vita Bonifacij octaui, vide Martinum Polonum, pa. 237. in append.

are to be obserued seriously: first, the vncertainetie of vnwritten traditions: secondly, the danger in giuing credit to the same. Now, it remaineth for the better contentation of the reader, to make answere to such obiections in defence of popish traditions, as the papists haue euer in their mouths, and boast of them, as if they were insoluble.

The first Obiection.

We doe not know, which bookes of the scripture are canonicall, and which are not, but onely by the vnwritten traditions of the Church: And yet is this a matter of faith, and very necessarie vnto saluation.

The answere.

This is that mightie obiection, wherein the papists glorie and boast beyond all measure; and say more rashly than wisely, that it can neuer be truly answered. I therefore shall desire the gentle reader to ponder well my words, and then to iudge of the matter, as right reason shall prescribe. My answere is this. First, there is great ods betweene the primitiue Church and the Church of late daies. Which to be so, the famous popish doctor *Durandus* will contest with me. For the Apostles (as *Durand* saith wisely) heard Christs doctrine, saw Christs myracles, and were repleniſhed with the holyghost; and cõsequently, they must needs be fit witnesses of all that Christ did and taught. But these adiuncts cannot be rightly ascribed to the late Bishops of Rome and their cursed Iesuited brood. Secondly, the old testament was deliuered by the Iewes, and confirmed by Christ and his Apostles: and therefore as the papists admit that tradition, and withall doe reiect their other manifold vnwritten traditions, which the Iewes in their *Talmud* affirme to be of *Moses*; euen so do we receiue this tradition, and reiect all vnwritten traditions contrarie to the same. Thirdly, the bookes of the new testament are but an exposition of the law and the Prophets;

Durand. in 3 ſ. d. 24. quæſt. 1.

Bellar. tom. 1. col. 187.

Vide August. tom. 6. pa. 184

phets; as I haue alreadie prooued in the first proposition of this present article: And consequently, it may be discerned and tryed by the same; as the godly Bereans tryed S. *Paules* preaching. Fourthly, when we affirme all thinges necessarie for our saluation, to be comprised and contained in the scripture: we then speake of them, as they are acknowledged and agreed vppon, both among the Iewes for the old Testament, in the which the new is comprehended: and ioyntly for the old and new, throughout the Christian world. And so this tradition is not excepted, but virtually implyed in our affirmation. Fiftly, the scriptures canonicall are discerned from not canonicall euen of themselues, like as the light is discerned from darkenesse, hardnesse from softnesse, and sweetnesse from bitternesse. Thy word ô Lord (saith the Prophet) is a lanterne to my feet, and a light vnto my pathes. We haue a right sure word of prophesie (saith S. *Peter*) whereunto if ye take heede, as vnto a light that shineth in a darke place, ye doe well, vntill the day dawne, and the day-starre arise in your hearts. Yet most true it is, that the faithfull onely can discerne it. For as the Apostle saith, If Christs Gospel be hid, it is hid in them that perish: in whome the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them which beleeue not, least the light of the Gospell of the glorie of Christ should shine vnto them. And the same Apostle elsewhere teacheth vs, that the spirituall man iudgeth all thinges. Which text, two famous Papists, *Lyranus* and *Carthusianus* doe expound, of things pertaining to our saluation. S. *Iohn* is consonant to S. *Paule*, affirming, that the vnction which the faithfull haue receiued, doth teach them all thinges. Yea, Christ himselfe saith, That his sheepe doe heare his voice. And he addeth, that they follow him, because they know his voice. But doubtlesse, if Christs sheepe, that is, the faithfull and Gods elect people, doe knowe his voice, and therefore doe follow him: then by a necessarie consequence, they can know Christ speaking to them in the

Act. 17. v. 11.

Ps. 119. v. 105

2. *Pet.* 1. v. 19

2. *Cor.* 5. v. 3.

1. *Cor.* v. 15.

1. *Iob.* 2. v. 27.

Iob. 10. 3 *ibid.* v. 4.

holy scripture, and so can discerne holy writ from prophane fables or stories, *Melchior Canus* a famous Papist, maketh this case cleere: his wordes are set downe in my Golden ballance.

Sixtly, the formall obiect of our faith is *veritas prima*, the first verity, or God himselfe, as *Dionysius Areopagita* teleth vs. Yea, *Aquinas* that famous papist surnamed their angelicall Doctor, teacheth the selfe same doctrine. *Non enim fides inquit, diuina alicui assentitur, nisi quia est à Deo reuelatum.* For diuine faith (saith *Aquinas*) will not yeeld assent to any thing, vnlesse it bee reuealed of God. Which truth of doctrine, Saint *Austen* confirmeth in these golden words: *Iam hic videte magnum sacramentũ fratres, sonus verborum nostrorum aures percutit, magister intus est. Nolite putare quenquam hominem aliquid discere ab homine. Admonere possumus per strepitum vocis nostræ: si non sit intus qui doceat, inanis sit strepitus noster. Quã multi hinc indocti exituri sunt? quantum ad iure pertinet, omnibus locutus sum, sed quibus vnctio illa intus non loquitur, quos spiritus sanctus intus non docet, indocti redeunt. Magisteria forinsecus adiutoria quædã sunt & admonitiones, Cathedram in cœlo habet qui corda docet. Sequitur, interior magister est qui docet, Christus docet, inspiratio ipsius docet Vbi illius inspiratio & illius vnctio non est, forinsecus inaniter perstrepunt verba.* Now brethren, behold here a great sacrament: the sound of our wordes pierceth your eares, but the master that teacheth you, is within. Thinke not, that man learneth any thing of man: we (preachers) may admonish by the sound of words: but if he be not within that teacheth, in vaine is our sound: how many will goe hence vntaught? For mine owne part, I haue spoken to all: but to whom that vnction speaketh not inwardly, whom the holy Ghost teacheth not within, they goe home vntaught, as they came. The outward teachings are some helpes & admonitions: but he sitteth in his chaire in heauen, that teacheth the hart, The master is within that teacheth, it is Christ that teacheth, it is his inspiration that instructeth

De diuinis nominib. cap. 7.

Aquinas, 2. 2. q. 1. art. 1. o.

Aug. in epist. Ioannis, tract. 3. tom. 9. col. 408.

eteth. Where his inspiration and his vnction is not, there the outward noise of words is in vaine: Thus writeth this auntient and learned father, with many moe wordes to the like effect. By whose doctrine we may learne sufficiently, if nothing else were said: that howsoeuer men teach, howsoeuer *Paul* plant, or *Apollo* water, yet will no increase follow, vnlesse God gaue the same. I therefore conclude, that wee doe not beleeue this booke or that booke to be canonicall, because this man or that man, or the Church saith so; but that the scripture is ἀξιόπιστος; that it hathin it selfe that dignity, which is worthy to haue credite; that the declaration of the Church, doth not make vs beleeue the scripture, but is only an outward helpe to bring vs thereunto; and that wee therefore indeede beleeue the scripture, and this or that booke to be canonicall, because God doth inwardly teach vs and persuade our hearts so to beleeue. For certes, if wee should beleeue, that this or that booke is canonicall scripture, because the Church saith so; then should the formall obiect of our faith, and the vltimate tearme into which our faith is resolued, be man, and not *prima veritas*, or God himselfe, as *Areopagita* and *Aquinas* teach vs. And it will not helpe the papists to replie out of Saint *Augustine*, That he would not haue beleeued the Gospell, vnlesse the authoritie of the Church had mooued him thereunto. For S. *Austens* words are these; *Nisi authoritas ecclesiæ me commoueret.* I would not haue beleeued the Gospell, if the authoritie of the Church had not iointly mooued me thereunto. For we must note, that there is a great difference betweene *mouere* and *commouere*. *Mouere* is to moue absolutely, and a part by it selfe; but *commouere* is to moue respectiuely and together with another thing. So S. *Austens* meaning is nothing else indeede but that the authoritie of the Church did outwardly concurre with the inward motion of the holy Ghost, to bring him to the faith of the Gospell. Now, Saint *Austens* meaning is this and none

Augustin. contra epist. Manich. tom. 6. cap. 5. pag. 79.

other; *viz.* that he maketh much more account of the vniuersall Church, than of *Manicheus* and his complices; because the Church did first moue him to heare the Gospell preached, and to giue some credit to the same. I say (some credit) because the Churches authoritie did onely moue him to beleeue the Gospell, *fide humana, non fide diuina:* with humane faith, not with faith diuine. For this diuine faith, with which we Christians doe beleeue the Gospell, proceedeth not from the outward teaching of man, but from the inward instruction of the holy Ghost, as I haue out of the same *Austen* already proued. Yea, the selfe same father declareth in the same Chapter, that he speaketh of himselfe as being a Manichee, not as being a Christian. What (saith Saint *Austen*) wouldest thou say to him, that should answere thee, I doe not beleeue it, but for the authority of the Church? And this sense is confirmed, because S. *Austen* confesseth in the very same chapter, that the authoritie of the Gospell is aboue the authoritie of the Church. And in the chapter aforegoing, after he hath told vs what kept him in the catholike Church, and there hath reckoned vp the consent of peoples and nations; authoritie begun with miracles, nourished with hope, increased with charitie, established with antiquitie: succession of priests from Saint *Peters* seate, and the name of Catholike; hee addeth, that though these things bee great motiues to keepe him in the vnitie of the Church, yet must the truth of the scriptures be preferred before them all. In regard whereof, he promiseth to giue more credit to *Manicheus* than to the Church, and to yeeld vnto his doctrine, if he shall be able to proue it out of the scripture: In the meane while he must giue him leaue to preferre the credit of the catholike Church before his bare words, especially, seeing the Church, but not *Manicheus*, was the outward meanes and externall help, that brought him to the faith of the Gospell.

Cap. 5. cont. epist. fundam.

The

The second Obiection.

The baptisme of infants is a matter of faith, but not conteined in the holy scriptures, *ergo* not all things necessarie for mans saluation are therein to be found.

The Answere.

I answere, that it is contained in the scriptures, and I proue it by sundry reasons. The first argument is drawne from the couenant. For infants being within the couenant, ought not to be debarred from the signe and seale thereof. I will establish my couenant betweene me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an euerlasting couenant, to be God to thee, and to thy seed after thee. *Gen.17.v.7.* Againe, you are the children of the Prophets, and of the couenant which God made to our fathers, saying to *Abraham*, euen in thy seede shall all the families of the earth be blessed. *Gen.15. Gen.22.* Againe, repent, and be euery one of you baptised in the name of Iesus Christ, for the remission of sinnes, and ye shall receiue the gift of the holy Ghost. For the promise was made to you, and to your children, and to all that are a farre off, euen so many as the Lord our God shall call. *Act.3.v.25. Act.2.v.38, 39.* Againe, if the first fruits be holy, the whole lumpe also is holy: And if the roote be holy, the boughes also. *Rom.11.v.16.* Againe, suffer the yong children, and stay them not from comming vnto me: for to such belongeth the kingdome of heauen. *Mat.19.v.14* And where Saint *Matthew* hath little children, then S. *Luke* hath, τα βρεφη infants, which can neither vnderstand, nor come. *Luk.18 v.17.* Againe, your children are holy yong children, therefore must be baptised. *1.Cor.7.v.14.*

The second argument is drawne from the analogie of the figure of the old testament. For circumcision to which baptisme succeeded, did pertaine to both ages, as well to yoong as to old. In whom also yee are circumcised with circumcision made without hands, by putting off the body of the flesh subiect to sinne, by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptisme, in whom yee are also risen *Coloss.2.v.11.*

 againe

againe through the faith of the operation of God, who raised him vp from the dead. Thus saith Saint *Paul:* by whose words we may learne sufficiently, that baptisme did succeed to circumcision, for the same end, vse, and purpose: *viz.* that by it we may, putting off the bodie of sinfull flesh, be buried together with Christ, and rise againe with him through faith.

The third argument is drawne, from the practise of the
Mat.28.v.19 Church. For the Apostles of our Lord Iesus were commaunded to baptise all sorts of people without exception. Goe therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the father, and of the sonne, and of the holy Ghost.
Act.16.v.15. Againe, wee reade in the historie Apostolicall, that the
Act.16.v.33. whole house of *Lydia* was baptised, neither yong nor old being excepted. Againe, we may finde in the acts, that the keeper of the prison at Philippos was baptised, and all they of his houshold incontinent. Againe in another place,
1.Cor,1.v.16. we may reade, that the whole family of *Stephanas* was baptised, not one at all exempted.

The Obiection.

Infants haue no faith, *ergo* they may not be baptised.

The Answere.

I denie the antecedent, because their faith and profession is this; to be borne of the faithfull, in the vnitie of the
Mar.9 v.42. Catholike Church. Againe, though they haue not actuall faith, yet haue they faith fundamentallie, and by inclination. In which sense our Lord Iesus doth reckon them among the faithfull, when he saith in this manner; Whosoeuer shall offend one of these little ones that beleeue in me, it is better for him if a milstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea. Infants therefore, when they are baptized in the Church for faithfull, are then deemed to beleeue after their manner. Who, albeit they haue not faith in act, yet haue they the spirit,

and

and vertue, or foundation of faith, by Gods operation in them. Neither ought this thing to seeme strange vnto vs. For, if the infants of the wicked ones haue infidelitie and impietie, though not in act yet in inclination by nature, as writers graunt; then truly may it be said, that the infants of the faithfull haue faith and pietie, though not in act, yet in inclination by grace. For grace cannot be of lesse force through Christ, than nature through the fall of *Adam*. for God saith plainely; I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed after thee. *Gen.17.v.7.*

The third Obiection.

We beleeue the trinitie of persons in vnitie of substance, but this is not in the scripture, *Ergo.*

The answere.

I denie the assumption; for the trinitie of persons is plainely auouched in the holy Gospell, where it is thus written; But the comforter which is the holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things. Thus saith our Lord Iesus. In which words, we see mention made of three distinct persons; first, of the Father, which sendeth; secondly, of the holy Ghost, which is sent; thirdly, of the Sonne, in whose name he is sent. *Ioh.14.v.26.* Againe in another place it is thus written; There are three which beare record in heauen, the Father, the Word, and the holy Ghost, and these three are one, *Item Matth.28. verse 19.* *1. Ioh.5.v.7.*

The fourth Obiection.

It is not to be found in the holy scripture, that Christ is consubstantiall, and of the same substance with the Father. *Ergo.*

The Answere.

The antecedent is false. For first, in the prophesie of *Zacharias* *Zach. cap.13.* *v.7.*

Zacharias I finde theſe wordes; ariſe O ſword, vpon my ſhepheard, and vpon the man that is my fellow, ſaith the Lord of hoſtes. Secondly, in many places of the new teſtament. Firſt, in theſe words; I and my Father are one. Secondly, in theſe words; If ye beleeue not me, beleeue the works; that ye may know and beleeue, that the Father is in me, and I in him. Thirdly, in theſe words; Who being in the forme of God, thought it no robberie to be equall with God. Fourthly, in theſe words; She ſhall bring foorth a ſonne, and thou ſhalt call his name Ieſus; for he ſhall ſaue his people from their ſinnes. For this reſpect ſaith holy *Athanaſius*, that albeit the words be not expreſſed in the ſcriptures, yet haue they that meaning which holy writ approoueth. Anſwere ô papiſts, if ye can; if not, repent for ſhame, and yeeld vnto the truth.

Eſa.9.6.
Ioh.10 30.
Ioh.10,38.
Phillip.2.6.
Heb.1.3.
Ioh.1.1,2.
Mat.1.21. & 23.
Athanaſ. de decret. Nic. ſynod.tom.2.

The

The eight Article. Of the impoſſibilitie of keeping Gods commandements in popiſh ſenſe.

TOuching this article, the reader muſt ſeriouſly obſerue with me this adiunct, (in popiſh ſenſe) becauſe it is both emphaticall, and of great moment. For I will not affirme ſimply and abſolutely, that Gods children can not keepe his commaundements in a godly ſenſe and chriſtian meaning; but this I conſtantly denie, and at this preſent intend in God to proue the ſame effectually againſt all Ieſuites and Ieſuited papiſts, That none haue kept, do keepe, or can keepe Gods commaundements in popiſh ſenſe and meaning. *viz.* that none are ſo pure, holy, and free from ſinne, that they can ſtand with God in iudgement, and challenge eternall life, as of debt due vnto them for their holy life. Marke well gentle reader, my diſcourſe; for I hope in God to hit the naile on the head, and to ſet downe that which will be as heauie to the papiſts heart, as a piece of lead.

The Apoſtle telleth vs in plaine and very expreſſe words, That the beſt liuers vpon earth are ſinners. *In multis enim offendimus omnes.* For we all offend in manie things. But certes, if it be true, as it is moſt true indeed, (for S. *Iames* being inſpired with the holy Ghoſt cannot lie) That the holy Apoſtles committed many ſinnes; then doubtleſſe it is not in euerie ones power, to keepe Gods commandements; neither will it helpe the papiſts to diſtinguiſh af- *Iacob.* 3. v. 2.

ter

ter their wonted manner, of mortall and veniall sinnes. For, besides that I haue proued alreadie in the sixt Article, that euery sinne is mortall in it owne proper nature; both the Greeke word ἀνομία, which signifieth the trãsgression of the law; and also the Hebrew word חטאה, which signifieth a declining from the right way, doe euidentlie conuince the same. For it can neuer be trulie said, that hee performeth and keepeth the law, which transgresseth the law or swarueth from the same. It is the truth which S. *Paul* alledgeth out of the law; Cursed is euerie one that abideth not in all things which are written in the booke of the law, to do them. It is also the truth, which S. *Iames* saith, That whosoeuer keepeth the whole law, and yet faileth in one point, is become guiltie of all. To which may be added innumerable texts, both of the old and new testament, that the best liuers vpon earth doe sinne, and transgresse Gods commaundements. Holy *Moses* telleth vs in the first booke of his Pentatench, That when God saw that the wickednes of man was great on the earth, and that all the imaginations of the thoughts of his heart were only euill continually, then it repented God that he had made man on the earth. *Iob* telleth vs, That God found no stedfastnes in his Saints: yea, he saith farther, That the heauens are not cleane in his sight. And he addeth these words, How much more is man abhominable and filthie, which drinketh iniquitie like water. The kingly Prophet saith, that in Gods sight none that liueth can be iustified. Wise *Salomon* saith, that no man liuing is able truely to say, he is cleane from sinne. The same wise man saith in like maner, that the iust man sinneth many times. *Esay* saith, that all our righteousnes is as filthie clouts. *Esdras* saith, he was ashamed for his own sinnes, and for the sinnes of the people, because their trespasse was growne vp vnto heauen. Saint *Paul* sheweth at large, that all men are sinners, and that no man is able to be iustified by his workes. All saith hee, both Iewes and Gentiles

Gal.3.v.10.
Iac.2.v.10.
Gen.6.v.5.
Iob.15.v.15. & 35.5.
Psal.143.v.2.
Prou.20.v.9.
Prou.24.16.
Esa.64.6.
Esdr.9.6.
Rom.3.v.9.10 12.19.23.

Gentiles are vnder sinne. There is none righteous, no not one: they haue all gone out of the way; they haue all beene made altogether vnprofitable: there is none that doth good, no not one. Now we know, that whatsoeuer the law saith, it saith to them which are vnder the law, that euery mouth may be stopped, and all the world be subiect to the iudgement of God. There is no difference, for all haue sinned, and are depriued of the glory of God, and are iustified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Iesus. Againe in another place, he hath these words: For they being ignorant of the righteousnesse of God, and going about to stablish their owne righteousnesse, haue not submitted themselues to the righteousnesse of God: the case is cleere and euident. For as the Prophet saith, If God should marke our iniquities, and reward vs after our deedes, none of vs were able to endure it.

Rom.10.v 3.

Psal.130. v.3.4.

Now, let vs heare S. *Austens* graue sentence, concerning this controuersie. *Diliges inquit, proximum tuum sicut teipsum: Deum vero ex toto corde, & ex tota anima; & ex tota mente, vt omnes cogitationes tuas, & omnem vitam, & omnem intellectum in illã conferas, à quo habes ea ipsa quæ conferas. Cum autem ais, toto corde, tota anima, tota mente, nullam vitæ nostræ partem reliquit, quæ vacare debeat, & quasi locum dare, vt alia re velit frui.* Thou shalt loue thy neighbour, saith he, as thy selfe; but God with thy whole heart, with thy whole soule, and with thy whole mind; that thou maist conferre vpon him all thy thoughts, and all thy life, and all thine vnderstanding, of whom thou hast receiued the selfe same which thou doest conferre or giue. But when he saith, with all thy heart, with all thy soule, with all thy mind, he hath left no part of our life which may be vacant, and as it were giue place, to haue fruition of any other thing.

Aug. de doctr. Christ. lib.1. cap.22.tom.3.

The same Saint *Austen* saith againe in another place; That this commaundement of louing God with all our heart, cannot be perfectly fulfilled of any man in this life:

August. de perfect. iustit. ratione. 16. col. 969. tom. 7.

These are his words; *In qua plenitudine charitatis præceptum illud implebitur: Diliges dominũ Deum tuũ ex toto corde tuo, & ex tota anima tua, & ex tota mente tua. Nam cum est adhuc aliquid carnalis concupiscentiæ, quod vel continendo frænetur, nõ omnimodo ex tota anima diligitur Deus. Non enim caro sine anima concupiscit, quamuis caro concupiscere dicatur, quia carnaliter anima concupiscit. Tunc erit iustus sine vllo omnino peccato, quia nulla lex erit in membris eius repugnans legi mentis eius, sed prorsus toto corde, tota anima, tota mẽte diligit Deum, quod est primum summumq; præceptum. Cur ergo nõ præciperetur homini ista perfectio, quamuis eam in hac vita nemo habeat? Nõ enim rectè curritur, si quo currendũ est nesciatur.* In which fulnesse of charitie that commaundement shall be fulfilled. Thou shalt loue thy Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soule, and with all thy mind. For whiles any part of carnall concupiscence is remayning, which may be suppressed by containing, God so long is not in euery respect loued with all the soule. For the flesh coueteth not without the soule, albeit the flesh be said to couet, because the soule coueteth carnally. Then shall the iust be without any sinne at all, because there shall be no law in his members rebelling against the law of his mind, but he shall loue God wholy with all his heart, with all his soule, and with all his mind, which is the first and chiefest commandement. Why therefore should not this perfection be commanded vnto man, although no man can haue it in this life? For they cannot run aright, who know not whither they should run.

Out of these words of this holy father, and great learned writer, I gather these worthy lessons: First, that by Gods holy commaundement all men are bound to loue God, with all their heart, with all their soule, and with all their mind: Secondly, that whosoeuer suffereth any part of this life to be vacant, and to haue fruition of any other thing, cannot fulfill this precept of louing God: Thirdly, that this precept of loue, cannot be perfectly kept in this

this life: Fourthly, that originall concupiscence remaining in the regenerate, is the hinderance and breach of this commaundement. Fiftly, that this perfection of loue is lawfully commaunded, albeit none liuing doth or can attaine vnto it. And consequently, that it is not possible to any pure mortall man, perfectly to keepe Gods commandements.

Aquinas the Popes great Doctor and canonised Saint, graunteth freely and affirmeth constantly, That the precept of louing God with the whole heart, cannot be kept perfectly in this life. These are his owne expresse words: *Respondeo, quod præceptum aliquod dupliciter potest impleri; Uno modo perfectè, alio modo imperfectè. Sequitur; intendit Deus per hoc præceptum, vt homo Deo totaliter vniatur: quod fiet in patria, quando Deus erit omnia in omnibus, vt dicitur. 1. Cor. 15. & ideo plenè & perfectè in patria implebitur hoc præceptum: In via autem impletur, sed imperfectè.* Aquinas 22. q. 44. art. 6. in corp. I answere, that the precept may be fulfilled two wayes; one way perfectly, another many vnperfectly. God intendeth by this precept, to haue man wholy vnited to himselfe; which shall be effected in heauen, when God shall be all in all. And therefore this precept shall be fulfilled perfectly and fully in the countrey, but in the way it is fulfilled vnperfectly. (That is to say, perfectly in heauen, which is called our countrey; and vnperfectly on earth, which is tearmed the way.)

Out of these golden wordes of the famous schooledoctour *Aquinas*, (whose doctrine two Popes haue authorized for authenticall) I obserue these points of great importance. First, that God by commaunding all men to loue him with their whole hearts, did intend to vnite all men wholy vnto himselfe; so as no part of their loue should be left vacant, to be bestowed otherwise. Secondly, that this precept of louing God as wee are bound, can be kept perfectly in heauen onely. Thirdly, that it

is not impossible in this life, to keepe Gods commaundements in a godly sense and meaning; because we may keepe them in some sort and measure, though not in that high and perfect degree which the law requireth at our handes. For our great popish Doctour (marke well his wordes) saith plainely and constantly; *In via impletur preceptum, sed imperfectè.* The precept is fulfilled in the way, (or in this life) but vnperfectly. So that, when the papists triumphing before the victorie, cry out against vs with open mouths, That we charge God with impietie, affirming him to haue commaunded to man things impossible; they may as well and with as much right and reason, exclaime against their owne deere doctor *Aquinas*, and consequently against their owne holy fathers the Popes, *Vrbanus* the fourth, and *Innocentius* the fift; who haue commanded and strictly charged to receiue his doctrine as sent from heauen, concerning both faith and manners. For my selfe doe here teach the selfe same doctrine with *Aquinas*, as his owne expresse words very flatly purport. For my wonted manner is, to confute poperie by the testimonies of best approoued popish writers.

August. Hunneus in epist. ad Pium 5.

Bernardus the Popes deere Monke and reuerend Abbot, iumpeth with *Aquinas* in these expresse words; *Quomodo ergo iubenda fuit, quæ implenda nullo modo erat? Aut si placet tibi magis de affectuali charitate dati fuisse mandatū, non inde contendo, dummodo acquiescas & tu mihi, quod minimè in vita ista ab aliquo hominū possit, vel poterit ad impleri. Quis enim sibi arrogare id audeat, quod* Paulus *ipse fatetur non comprehendisse? nec latuit preceptorem, precepti pondus hominum excedere vires: sed indicauit vtile ex hoc ipso sua illos insufficientia admoneri, & vt scirent sanè, ad quem iustitiæ finem niti pro viribus oporteret. Ergo mandando impossibilia, non preuaricatores homines fecit, sed humiles, vt omne os obstruatur, & subditus fiat omnis mundus Deo: quia ex operibus legis, non iustificabitur omnis caro coram illo. Accipientes quippe mandatum, & sentientes*

Bernar. in cant. serm. 50. tom. 1. col. 931

sentientes defectum, clamabimus in cœlum, & miserebitur nostri Deus; & sciemus in illa die, quia nō ex operibus iustitiæ quæ fecimus nos, sed secūdum suam misericordiam, saluos nos fecit. How then was it commanded, which by no meanes could be performed? or if thou rather thinke, that the commandement was giuen of affectuall charitie, I will not contend with thee therein, so thou also wilt yeeld vnto me herein, That no man in this life is able to keepe and performe the same. For who dareth to challenge that to himselfe, which *Paul* confesseth he could neuer attaine vnto? neither for all that was the commander ignorant, that the weight of the commandement did surpasse the power and reach of man; but he deemed it a thing profitable for them, that hereby they should be admonished of their insufficiencie, and might know to what end of righteousnesse they ought with their best indeuours to applie themselues. Therefore by commaunding things impossible, he made not men preuaricatours, but humble, that euery mouth might bee stopped, and all the world made subiect vnto God, because by the workes of the law, no flesh can be iustified in his sight. But after that we haue receiued the commandement, and thereby perceiue our owne want, we must cry vp to heauen, and God will haue mercie on vs; and then shall we know, that he hath saued vs, not for the workes of righteousnesse which we haue done, but according to his owne (free) mercy. Thus writeth their own deere Abbot *Bernardus*: out of whose wordes, I obserue many excellent documents. First, that God hath giuen vs those commaundements, which wee cannot possibly keepe and performe. Secondly, that God knew right well, that it is not in our power to keepe his lawes. Thirdly, that God commanded to vs impossible things, that we might thereby acknowledge our owne insufficiency, & wholy rely vpon his fauor, help, and mercy. Fourthly, that we might hereby know, that our saluation proceedeth of mercie,

and not of the workes of righteousnesse which we haue done, and wherein the papists seeke merit and iustification. So then, the doctrine which I now teach, is not my doctrine onely, but the flat doctrine of Saint *Austen*; yea, and the selfe same doctrine which the best learned papists haue taught before me.

That it is not possible for man, to keepe Gods commaundements perfectly in this life; no other proofe is needefull, saue onely the Lords Prayer. For in it, the best liuer vpon earth is taught, to aske forgiuenesse and pardon for his sinnes: and doubtles where pardon must be demaunded, there the law is not exactly obserued. The vsuall practise of all papists, is consectarie hereunto. For in their ordinarie and daiely masses, as also in their quotidian auricular confessions, they confesse three seuerall times their most grieuous sinnes, in these wordes; *Mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa.* In which publique daily confession, they must either confesse, that they deale hypocritically, dissemble damnably, and mocke God most irreligiously; or els doubtles, that they cannot keepe Gods commaundements, as they beare the world in hand they do. Now it remaineth, that I answere to some popish obiections, which the papists deeme and repute insoluble.

Nota, quod ne veniale quidem peccatum potest in deum referri.
Ergo auertit a fine vltimo.
Ergo est peccatū mortale.

The first Obiection.

Mat. 19. v. 20 The young man told Christ, that he had kept all the commaundements, from his youth vp. VVhom Christ reprooued not, as though he had not kept them indeed, but exhorted him to perfection, in selling all his possessions.

The Answere.

I answere both with Saint *Austen* and Saint *Hierome*, That

That the young man answered vntrulie, when hee said, hee had kept all the commaundements. Saint *Austen* hath these words; *Ille quidem tristis abscessit, qui viderit quemadmodum illa legis mandata seruauerat. Puto enim quod se arrogantius quam verius, seruasse respondera.* He went away sorrowfull, who knew how he had kept the commandements of the law. For I thinke, he answered more arrogantlie then trulie, that he had kept them. Saint *Hierome* saith plainelie and roundlie, *Mentitur*, He lieth. And the circumstance of the texts going afore and following, doe purport no lesse vnto vs. *August. epist. 89. col. 264.*

The second Obiection.

Saint *Paul* saith, For not the hearers of the law are iust with God, but the doers of the law shall be iustified. *Rom. 2. v. 13.*

The Answere.

Saint *Paul* meaneth nothing lesse in these words, then that a man in Gods sight can be iustified in his workes: But he goeth about to conclude all vnder sinne, and so to haue neede of the glorie of God; because none is able to performe and keepe the law. For his whole scope and intent is this; to proue that the Iewes did in vaine boast against the Gentiles that they had the law, seeing they did not keepe the same. As if he had said; if ye will be iustified by the law, ye must performe and keepe the law, which ye doe not. For not the hearers of the law, but the doers are iust in Gods sight. I willinglie graunt, and will it not denie; that if any of you Papists can perfectly obserue and keepe the law, the same papist shall be iustified by the merit of his workes: but if any such papist could be found, (which I am sure is impossible) yet should that papist heare what Saint *Paul* saith of holy *Abraham*. For saith he, if *Abraham*

Rom.4.v.2. *braham* were iustified by works, he hath glorie, (or wherein to boast) but not before God.

The third Obiection.

Mat.19.v.17 If thou wilt enter into life, keepe the commaundements.

The answere.

Our Sauiour Christ doth not shew in this place, how men doe attaine vnto eternall life; but hee sheweth what perfect obseruation of Gods law is required of them, who looke to bee iustified by the workes of the law. This my answere is cleered, by the question proposed vnto Christ, which was this; VVhat good thing shall I doe, that I may haue eternall life? CHRIST answered; If thou wilt haue eternall life by doing good workes, then must thou keepe Gods commaundements. But this is impossible, as is alreadie prooued.

Vide B. in 3. cap. ad gal.

The fourth Obiection.

Mat.11.v.30. 1.Iohn.5.v.3. Christ saith, My yoke is easie, and my burden is light. Aud Saint *Iohn* saith, his commaundements are not heauie.

The Answere.

Non loquitur hic de iugo & onere legis, sed Euangelij. The law of God is impossible to be kept in such perfection, as the same requireth at our hands, as I haue alreadie proued. Neuertheleſie, the yoke of Christ is sweete, and his burden light, to all them which beleeue in him. For (as Saint *Peter* saith) The yoke of the law

AR.15.10.11.

is

is such a burden, as neither wee, nor our fathers were able to beare: but wee beleeue to be saued by the grace of our Lord Iesus. Christ hath taken away the curse of the law: Christ hath satisfied for our transgressions of the law: Christ sent by God in the similitude of sinfull flesh, blotted out the hand-writing that was against vs, and nailed it vpon the crosse. There is no condemnation to them which are in Christ Iesus. Christ is our iustification, our sanctification, and our redemption. By faith in Christ, wee doe ouercome the world. Christ is so mercifull, that hee refresheth all those which come vnto him. This being so, wee may trulie say, that in Christ wee fulfill the law: because he is our righteousnesse, our sanctification, and our redemption; because hee hath ouercome death; because hee hath clothed vs with his righteousnesse; because hee hath couered our nakednesse with his garments; because in him wee haue gotten the victorie ouer Hell, Death, and Damnation.

Gal.3.13. *Rom.8.3.* *Col.2.14.* *Rom.8.1.* *1.Cor.1.30.* *1.Iohn.5.4.* *Mat.11.v.28* *Col.2.14.* *1.Iohn.5.4.* *Act.15.11.*

This is it that Saint *Austen* saith, in these golden wordes; *Omnia ergo mandata tunc facta deputantur, quando quicquid non fit, ignoscitur.* All the commaundements are then reputed as done, when whatsoeuer is not done, is (of mercie) forgiuen.

August. libr. 1. retract. ca. 19.

The first Obiection.

Saint *Hierome* saith, He is to be detested as a blasphemer, that affirmeth God to haue commaunded any impossible thing. And Saint *Austen* saith, God can neither commaund things impossible, because he is iust, neither condemne a man for that which he could not auoyd, because he is mercifull.

Hieron. contr. Pelag. lib. 3. & 4. *August. serm. 61. de temp. tom. 10.*

The Answere.

I answere first, that hee is to bee detested as a blasphemer, that affirmeth God to haue commaunded any thing vnto man, which was either impossible in it selfe to be done, or to be done of man, as man. I say (impossible in it selfe) because otherwise, Christ himselfe could not haue fulfilled the law: which to hold, is flat blasphemie against the Sonne of God. I say (impossible to be done of man, as man;) because otherwise, the Protoplast *Adam* could not haue kept the lawe: which to hold, is most absurd, and against all learning and learned men.

Secondly, that hee is to be detested as a blasphemer, whosoeuer affirmeth, that any man in particular being a true beleeuer, cannot keepe and fulfill Gods commaundements; in him, of whose fulnesse wee haue all receiued, and whose righteousnesse is ours, by his free gift and grace.

Iohn.1.16. 1.Cor.1.30.

Thirdly, that Gods commaundements may in some measure (that is to say, imperfectly) bee kept euen in this life, of all the regenerate. And this not my answere, but euen that answere which the famous Papist *Aquinas* maketh, to the obiection out of Saint *Hierome*: whose answere is very sufficient to stop the mouthes of all Papists, seeing his testimonie is to them as if it were an oracle from Heauen. To Saint *Austen* the same answere is very consonant, as both by the precedent and subsequent words will appeare. And if there be any Papists, whose appetites this answere cannot satisfie: of those Papists I would demaund this one thing, Why infants not baptised before their death, are iustlie damned for originall sinne, seeing they could not possibly auoid the same?

Aquinas,22. q.44.art.6. ad prim.

Omittatur hæc clausula, meo iudicio.

This is a Dilemma which no papist can auoyd.

He

He that would knowe Saint *Austens* meaning more fully, both touching this obiection and others of like qualitie, may reade the same holy Father in his booke *De Corrept. & gratia*; and therein finde much excellent matter for his contentation in that behalfe.

August. de correp. & grat. cap. 12. & 13. tom. 7.

Answere ô Papists, if ye can; if not, repent for shame, and yeeld vnto the truth.

* * *

τέλος.

Δόξα τῷ Θεῷ.